FEBRUARY 1953 PRICE 1s. 6d. NET.

The Expository Times

FOUNDED IN 1889 BY
JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

EDITORS
A. W. HASTINGS, M.A.
Rev. E. HASTINGS, M.A., D.D.

Contents

PAGE

I. NOTES OF RECENT EXPOSITION—Dr. Langmead Casserley on the Retreat from Christianity—Theology: A Criticism of Life—Meet the Greek Testament—The Centurion's Remark at the Cross 129

II. BOOKS ON THE PERSON OF CHRIST: H. M. RELTON'S 'A STUDY IN CHRISTOLOGY.' By the Reverend A. R. Vine, M.A., B.Sc., D.D., Yorkshire United Independent College, Bradford 132

III. LITERATURE 136

IV. SCIENCE AND RELIGION: THE PRESENT POSITION FROM A SCIENTIST'S POINT OF VIEW. By Archibald W. Sloan, B.Sc., M.B., Ch.B., F.R.F.P.S., M.R.C.P., The University, Glasgow 142

V. THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN. By the Reverend C. E. Raven, D.D., F.B.A., Cambridge . 146

VI. IN THE STUDY—
1. Virginibus Puerisque 148
2. The Christian Year 149

VII. CONTRIBUTIONS AND COMMENTS—
1. ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί. By the Reverend H. J. Flowers, B.A., B.D., Swansea . 155
2. 'Impositio Manus.' By the Reverend Maurice Bévenot, S.J., Heythrop College, Chipping Norton, Oxon 156

VIII. RECENT FOREIGN THEOLOGY. By Professor H. H. Rowley, D.D., Manchester . . 157

IX. ENTRE NOUS—Religious Education: Biblical Archaeology—East Africa: The Missionary Factor 158

VOLUME LXIV. No. 5

38 GEORGE ST. : T. & T. CLARK : EDINBURGH
EDITORIAL AND ADVERTISING OFFICES, KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

JESUS MASTER AND LORD

A Study in the Historical Truth of the Gospels

H. E. W. TURNER, M.A., B.D.

Lightfoot Professor of Divinity in the University of Durham

An important study of the Life and Person and Teaching of Jesus Christ, crystallizing the chief results up to the present of the critical study of the Gospels.

February **21s.**

WHY I AM NOT A ROMAN CATHOLIC

KENNETH N. ROSS

Vicar of All Saints', Margaret Street

Extracts from this book were serialised in the *Church Times* during the Autumn of 1952. It is an important study of the Roman claims as viewed by a prominent Anglo-Catholic, and should attract much attention on both sides.

Just Published **7s. 6d.**

CRISIS IN KENYA

Christian Commonsense on Mau Mau and the Colour Bar

BISHOP WALTER CAREY

Missionary in Kenya

Just Published **2s.**

READINGS ON THE PSALMS

BISHOP PHILIP LOYD

The late Bishop Philip Loyd commenced a devotional Commentary on the Psalms in a series of readings throughout the year, but it was only half finished at the time of his death. The material has been arranged in convenient form and will be found of much value for Lent meditations.

Just Published **5s.**

'IS IT NOTHING TO YOU?'

A Recollection of the Seven Words

JOOST DE BLANK

Bishop of Stepney

An imaginative series of Meditations for the Three Hours. They will help preachers and also those who wish to follow the Three Hours' service devoutly by themselves.

Just Published **2s. 6d.**

MOWBRAYS

28 MARGARET STREET, W. 1

New Books

His Appearing and His Kingdom

By T. F. GLASSON, M.A., D.D. *Demy 8vo.* 16*s. net*

What is a twentieth century Christian to believe concerning the return of Christ and the Last Judgment? What is to be the end of history and the human scene? Every thinking Christian who desires to attain to a fully integrated faith must look eagerly towards any writings which offer help in these difficult times.

Principalities and Powers

Studies in the Christian Conflict in History

By E. GORDON RUPP, M.A., D.D. 7*s. 6d. net*

This is a brilliant and penetrating study of the age-old conflict of good and evil for everyone who would understand the timeless truths and obligations of the Christian faith.

Why I Believe

A Symposium by

THE REV. PROF. JOHN FOSTER, M.A., D.D.
THE VERY REV. PRINCIPAL JOHN BAILLIE, D.D.
THE VERY REV. JOHN WHITE, C.H., D.D., LL.D.
PROF. DAVID CAIRNS
MRS. ERNEST JARVIS
THE REV. GEORGE F. MACLEOD, M.A., D.D.
THE RIGHT REV. KENNETH WARNER, D.S.O., M.A., Bishop of Edinburgh, and
KATHARINE TREVELYAN

Edited by JOHN FOSTER 5*s. net*

In this symposium a number of leading men and women give their personal testimony, and state, in terms which ordinary men and woman can understand, how they arrived at the faith which they hold.

THE EPWORTH PRESS

25-35 CITY ROAD :: LONDON, E.C.1

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

FORMERLY Lecturer in Sociology at the University College of the South-West, Exeter, Dr. J. V. Langmead CASSERLEY is now Professor of Dogmatic Theology at the General Theological Seminary, New York, and he appears to have found a certain exhilaration in the crossing of the Atlantic. At any rate, when he came back to London in 1951 to deliver the Maurice Lectures at King's College, he succeeded in being very lively and provocative, and one only requires to read the published record of them, *The Retreat from Christianity in the Modern World*,[1] to realize just how provocative he set himself out to be. If it is a calm, sober, and pedestrian study of theology in the last two hundred and fifty years that any one wishes, then he must go to some other source of enlightenment, but if one is prepared to be challenged in crisp and epigrammatic style, and to see one's pet theories overturned with a certain gay abandon, then Dr. Langmead CASSERLEY is not to be missed.

Objection may legitimately be taken to the title, and especially to the use of the word 'Retreat.' It is bad psychology to use this word, particularly when the writer appears to be much more at home as a marauder emitting bursts of fire, an expert with the flame-thrower, than he would ever be securely entrenched in a dug-out where the Christian religion is concerned; all Dr. Langmead CASSERLEY's instinct is to attack its enemy, wherever the enemy may be, and always with an assured gaiety and lightheartedness.

His general theme is that in the last two and a half centuries there have been two retreats from Christianity; one into irreligion, the other into religion. The first creates a vacuum; the second revives all the old idols from which the gospel may have to deliver man all over again. 'Religion' he distinguishes from Christianity. It is neither unambiguously good nor bad. However refined, spiritualized, and intellectualized, it remains idolatry. For the unhappy results of the twofold 'retreat' it is soon obvious that Dr. Langmead CASSERLEY holds theologians in the period under review to have a large share of responsibility. The title of one of his main chapters, 'The Ineptitude of Modern Theology,' is proof enough of that. He talks of 'the comparative ineffectiveness and persistent irrelevance of a great deal of Christian theology and apologetics during the period which is our particular concern.' We may well be inclined to ask if this is a fair indictment he makes, bearing in mind at the same time the saying that the Church is busy answering questions which nobody is asking.

Dr. Langmead CASSERLEY's main complaint is that theology has too largely become Biblical and historical rather than philosophical. By comparison with the classical standards of the Middle Ages and of the Early Church its goal since the Reformation has been too limited. There is little corresponding to Athanasius on the Incarnation, or Augustine's 'City of God,' or the 'Summa Theologica' of Aquinas. The only kind of honourable mention goes to Butler's 'Analogy' and Maurice's 'Kingdom of Christ.' It is now a detailed scholarship that is of the first concern. 'The sort of theology which seems to be little more than a by-product of Greek grammar, and whose exercises consist of a series of excursions into the realms of philology, is all too familiar. Browning's Grammarian could find a comfortable and congenial home in not a few of our places of theological learning.' 'Theology, in its greatest periods, is what Matthew Arnold said literature ought to be: *A criticism of life*. In too much theology the predominant atmosphere is that of archaeology, with the inevitable suggestion that here we have to do with dead things.'

Peculiarly abhorrent to Dr. Langmead CASSERLEY appear to be the 'New Testament Word Books,' and writings of that kind. He does not believe that swiftly composed letters ought to be utilized in this fashion to track down and define accurately the precise meaning of a New Testament word. 'Biblical study is not theology. The subject matter of theology is life, the life of the universe and the life of man considered in their relation to the will and purpose of the Creator. The truly prophetic theologian must fuse the imaginative and speculative gifts of the philosopher with the sober responsibility of the scholar if he is to

[1] Longmans; 12s. 6d. net.

bring the results of cautious scholarship to life.' It is rather surprising that Dr. Langmead CASSERLEY, when in this truculent mood, and looking around for heads to hit, does not point out what some others have done, that the World Council of Churches in carrying out its excellent task has set up so many Commissions that theologians have had their chief interest directed to subjects like the meaning of the Church, or of worship, or to discussions on the validity of Orders. A composite work follows, largely unreadable, in which great slabs of not very relevant information are reverently interred, and 'Faith and Order' becomes 'Scepticism and Confusion.' Here is a theme after Dr. Langmead CASSERLEY'S own heart, and it is difficult to know how he missed it.

At the same time it has to be recognized (and Dr. Langmead CASSERLEY does not appear to do justice to this fact) that the theologian's task becomes ever harder. In Pre-Reformation days there was a large common ground of agreement. Questions of Biblical interpretation mostly did not arise at all, and the Christian presuppositions were generally accepted as relevant and binding, even by those who flouted them. Nowadays the theologian must first be a considerable scholar, a Biblical scholar, and he must keep abreast of the march of science, particularly in the realms of astronomy and nuclear physics. He must know the most recent developments of psychological thought, and be prepared to meet the challenge of Logical Positivism, if that is what it still calls itself, while in addition he ought to be a considerable historian, for verdicts are changing. The Dark Ages are no longer the Dark Ages, for example. Nor is the theologian's task made easier by the necessity of dealing with Communism, its history, its presuppositions, its assertion of the economic factor in the scheme of events. If theology is to be a criticism of life, by Dr. Langmead CASSERLEY'S own standard, then the number able to criticise must be comparatively small. Surely there is no harder task than that of the theologian to-day; if he is inept, at any rate he may be forgiven.

The names of Brunner, Tillich, Raven, and Farmer are reminders to us that not a few of our ablest theologians are endeavouring to meet Dr. Langmead CASSERLEY'S request, and it is evident that, while any one system of theology could only at the moment be grossly inadequate, we are not without the benefit of the insights of honest thinkers who, themselves convinced of the truth of the Christian revelation, are determined to interpret all experience and all life in terms of it.

Dr. Langmead CASSERLEY has given us a lively and a stirring book. If he provokes, it is with the highest of all aims in view, and he will not be satisfied until the territories lost to Christian influence are regained. One rather imagines that he will be found in the vanguard of the new attack.

'Very few people now know Greek. Even among the clergy there are many who have not enough of it to be of much use.' This is the rather sad note on which Adam Fox, Canon of Westminster, begins his little book with the inviting title, *Meet the Greek Testament*.[1]

'tis true; 'tis pity;
And pity 'tis 'tis true.

Once in our Grammar Schools the boys spoke Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. Now in the schools Hebrew is dead, Latin is fighting a hard battle, and Greek is rapidly on the way out, driven to the wall by the victorious devotees of science; and the successors of the boys who learned Greek and thrilled to 'the surge and thunder of the Odyssey' or marched—in spirit—with Xenophon and his gallant ten thousand, now apply their minds to the laws of physics or the mysteries of electronics and the fissile atom. One sad consequence is that we are getting to-day a Greek-less clergy. To be sure, candidates for holy orders are normally required to possess a modicum of Greek before they set foot in the divinity halls; but the little they get is hurriedly assimilated and soon, in the hurly-burly of the modern ministry, forgotten.

Sic transit gloria Graeca! Once you might expect your minister to be a tolerable Grecian; your intelligent layman might of a Sunday be found following the New Testament lesson in the original Greek; you might even have in the back pew of the church somebody like 'Uncle Johnston' (in Dr. John Brown's fine epistolary biography of his father) who knew the Greek Testament better than his scholarly minister and would 'energize' on problems of exegesis or the properties of *men* and *de*. These days are gone. Will they ever come back?

It may be said that the loss is not so great as might appear. After all, have we not Weymouth, and Moffatt, and Goodspeed, and the R.S.V. to give us excellent English guidance on the meaning of the Greek? Have not some of our greatest evangelists been singularly innocent of 'Christianity in Greek'? And is it not true that if a man

[1] S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net.

cannot preach the gospel on the basis of the Authorised Version he will not preach at all? (Two or three years ago a distinguished Gael, pleading in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland that some Highland students be excused the study of Hebrew, eloquently maintained that whereas he had heard many good sermons preached in the Gaelic, and many good sermons preached in the English, he had never in all his life heard a single good sermon preached in the Hebrew !)

Bating the last one in brackets, these are fair contentions; and yet those of us who have been nurtured on the Greek Testament, love its very script, and rejoice to read the *ipsissima verba* of St. Paul or St. John, will not easily be persuaded that the loss is small. To those who aver that modern translations can give us the sense of the Greek verity in English, we shall feel constrained to reply in the words of Canon Fox: 'Well, I should say we Grecians thought we came to know the exact meaning of a good many words through the Greek and had some sort of an outline of New Testament teaching which we could never have got nearly so well in English.'

A generation ago Professor A. T. Robertson, author of the biggest Grammar of the Greek New Testament in existence, argued the same case with engaging fervour. How much, he said, of the Greek Testament—delicate turns of thought, subtle nuances of language—cannot be translated. 'The freshness of the strawberry cannot be preserved in the extract.' Good and useful as our modern translations are, they 'all of them fail to bring out all that is in the Greek.' The preacher, as a Bible specialist, is bound to know his New Testament in the original tongue. 'Sermons lie hidden in Greek roots, in prepositions, in tenses, in the article, in particles.' So 'grammar (Greek) may be a means of grace,' 'the lexicon may point the way to life' and the preacher who keeps harking back constantly to the Greek of Gospels and Epistles will find that his message remains as fresh as 'a May morning.'

Discount the pardonable enthusiasm of the specialist, if you like, yet you must admit that he has a good case. Greek does help. A little is better than none, on the principle that a little per cent. is better than nothing; and a lot of Greek—well, we all remember Dr. Johnson's remark about Greek and old lace.

These rambling reflections are meant to reinforce Canon Fox's charming invitation to 'meet the Greek Testament.' To whet his prospective Grecian's appetite for the treat in store for him, the good Canon handles first and briefly what he calls the 'externals'—the books of the New Testament, their contents, dates, and authors; the original MSS and the science of textual criticism; the actual problem of buying a Greek Testament. Part II of his book, called 'Interpretation,' has such witty chapter headings (and sub-headings) as these: 'The Greek language—a not wholly imperfect instrument; Words—about 5,420 different ones; the Greek Testament in English Dress—and very handsomely apparelled; Epistles—in which are some things hard to be understood,' and so forth, the whole ending in a capital chapter on the Roman Empire in the first century.

All this is prelude to Part III, which is a dialogue in the authentic manner of Plato on some palmary New Testament words. The interlocutors, who assemble in a garden outside Westminster Abbey and are obviously Canon Fox and his brother clerics, take to themselves Greek names out of Paul's Epistles and fall to talking. We have space only for two short extracts from their conversation about the word 'son':

'Perhaps we had better take the word Son, Philologus went on. If I spell out the Greek letters for the word Son, it looks rather odd, HUIOS, but when you say it, it simply sounds like Why-oss, with plenty of H at the beginning.

'Is that the way the Greeks pronounced it? Hermas asked. Not a bit, but the tradition always was, until lately, to pronounce Greek and Latin as though they were English, and I always do it still. It seems quite sensible. . . .'

A little later, a propos of the centurion's remark at the foot of the Cross:

'What did the centurion mean? asked Hermas. I always thought it wonderful he saw the truth like that.

'But quite possibly he didn't see the truth you think he saw, Patrobas explained. A reputable commentary—Alfred Plummer on *St. Luke*—says that perhaps he did not mean much. Perhaps he only meant, "Well, he was a hero."'

We hope these samples give some impression of Canon Fox's delightful 'Platonising' of the New Testament. If his book encourages some Christians who have no Greek to acquire some in order to read the New Testament in the original (and why did not the Canon suggest a serviceable text-book when he was at it?) he will cheer the Canon's heart—and the hearts of all of us who would like to see a revival of Greek in these Greek-less days.

Books on the Person of Christ

H. M. Relton's 'A Study in Christology'

By the Reverend A. R. Vine, M.A., B.Sc., D.D., Yorkshire United Independent College, Bradford

The wide and frayed wave front of theological thought, showing greater diversity than any other except possibly that of philosophy, owes its width and diversity to the fact that theology attempts an answer to the totality of human problems within the framework of total human experience. Like philosophy, theology is unable to confine itself to the realm of its own ideas. Granted certain axioms and postulates, the mathematician pursues his subject with no anxiety as to the stability of ground already occupied: the directions for advance are usually fairly clear, and the shore from which he launches is solid beneath him. But with the theologian it is not so. He is endeavouring to give a reasoned answer to the urgent and ultimate questions, based indeed on revelation, but necessarily keyed into the whole complex of contemporary knowledge. In no other realm have objections to be met from so many different quarters. The mathematician can only be criticized on the ground of unsound mathematics; but the theologian can be attacked because his views are held to be illogical, philosophically unsound, ill-grounded historically, out of accord with modern views on physics, biology, or cosmology, or even because he does not accord with some new psychological theory. It is little wonder, then, that the battles of theology have so constantly to be refought, that the front is so wide, and that current theological systems are almost as numerous as contemporary theologians.

Far, then, from diversity in theology being a ground of criticism, it is on the other hand evidence of the conviction and eagerness with which protagonists of the religious approach to life endeavour to keep revelation and its interpretation in line with the assured results of contemporary knowledge and above legitimate destructive criticism. It also becomes evident why there are inevitably many schools of theology at any one time. We may expect to find the eager omnivore, anxious to assimilate every new finding in literary analysis, historical research, and every other line of human study, and to produce a theology squaring with all these things and as up-to-date as they. His task is herculean; he will follow many wills-of-the-wisp but he will be in the van on those not so frequent occasions when a new insight has really been added to the solid stratum of knowledge. We may equally expect to find the cautious conservative, not very ready to believe that the half-digested researches of the last fifty years outweigh in value the positions gradually reached during the preceding two thousand, cynically disposed to believe that to-day's fad will be forgotten by to-morrow, and not prepared to rush out for every 'Lo here,' or 'Lo there.' Few hold either of these positions in the extreme form. The modernist is not unaware of the evanescent character of much of that with which he is trying to deal, nor is he foolish enough to think the treasures of the past are nothing but lumber. The conservative is equally aware that certain modern trends are irreversible, that certain elements in modern knowledge are incontrovertible, that there are certain findings which must be accepted by all but wilful obscurantists.

It would not be difficult to set the Christologists of the last fifty years along the 'wide and frayed wave front' of our first sentence, ranging them from extreme modernists on the left to orthodox conservatives on the right. Previous articles in this series have dealt mostly with some occupying middle positions; in **A Study in Christology,** the subject of this article, Dr. H. Maurice Relton takes a definitely conservative and orthodox position. There is, however, much misunderstanding as to the implications of those words. There are some who seem to think that a theologian who accepts a creed or dogma has thereby forfeited all opportunity for further thought on that particular matter. Such is by no means the case. Two major tasks remain: to discover the full significance and implications of the dogmatic statement, and to relate it to the context of contemporary thought. It is correctly to be inferred that the full significance of a creed or dogma was not always apparent even to those who formulated it. Sometimes, indeed, they seem to have been led to a statement they themselves can hardly have fully understood, the eternal generation of the Logos implied in the Creed of Nicaea being an example.

Dr. Relton, then, believes that the controversies of the early centuries, which resulted in the formulation of orthodox theology, were neither vain nor destitute of present significance. He holds that

acute minds applied themselves to these problems with a metaphysic not less penetrating than our own, and that their results are of lasting value. Such a view is, of course, bound up with certain views on Catholicity and the nature of the Church ; but those of the Reformed Tradition need to remind themselves, more often than some of them do, that they too stem from the undivided Catholic Church of the early centuries, and that repudiation of the Great Councils was no part of the Reformation.

In Part I of his book Dr. Relton expounds the ancient Christology in its own terms, showing how the successive stages in the problem of the Person of Christ emerged, and how each problem was faced. We ought not to overlook either the intensity of concern or the rigidity of logic with which the problems were faced. It must be remembered that orthodox Christology is not a system ingeniously devised to explain how Jesus of Nazareth was the Word become Flesh. Orthodox Christology, starting from the records and convictions of the Early Church, emerged during the travail of five centuries as the enunciation of the convictions of those who had wrestled with the successive stages of the problem, convinced that certain ways had been stopped and that others had been opened, satisfied that what they said was true even if they could not fully comprehend it. That last fact must be emphasized. The Chalcedonian Definition, for example, does not pretend to explain exactly how Jesus Christ was both truly God and truly Man : it asserts the fact, states certain of the conditions, and remains a monument to the conviction of a faith transcending comprehension. We do well to recognize that characteristic of ancient Christology, in interesting contrast to some modern attempts : ancient Christology was concerned to know how the Person of Christ should be thought of, even if the terms defied logical relation. Logic and neat system too often characterized those whose views were rejected, such as Arius, Apollinarius, Nestorius, and Eutyches. Athanasius, Cyril, and others in their succession, could not always produce the logical arguments ; but they had an unerring instinct as to what were the unsurrenderable postulates, and little by little orthodox Christology took form, and the right way in which to think of our Saviour became established. I state it as a deep personal conviction that no one has the right to try his hand at evolving some neat theory as to the Person of Christ unless and until he has worked through the acute controversies of those early centuries, has understood their profound inner significance, and has become able to translate those controversies into corresponding modern terms. So many modern Christologies are rehashes of anciently rejected solutions, without even ancient precision to commend them. The bold beginner in chess is sometimes too ignorant to realize that better minds than his have worked over all the variations from the classical openings and have found them defective. Our beginner may find a better opening ; but he had better master the ancient wisdom first. Dr. Relton would concur in the above sentences. He says : ' It is easy enough to reject the enormous labour and the acute thought of many minds in the ancient Church, and to dismiss their efforts as the outworn results of a discredited philosophy. We find in some modern writings a tendency to disparage the work done by the Fathers of the ancient Church, and to regard the Creeds and Definitions of the Councils as of comparatively little value in view of our supposed enormous advances in knowledge. Dr. Loofs, in his recent work, entitled *What is the Truth about Jesus Christ?* commits himself to a startling and significant statement when he writes : " There is hardly a single learned theologian (I know of none in Germany) who defends the orthodox Christology in its unaltered form." On all sides we hear the demand for restatement in terms of modern thought. But whilst we admit the need for reviewing the ancient Christology afresh with the aid of all the light our modern knowledge can possibly shed upon it, nevertheless we refuse to regard the work of the ancients as in any sense a sheer waste of strength, and relatively of little or no value to-day. On the contrary, we believe that the most our modern thought can add to their labours will be the confirmation in substance of the results they reached. The reinterpretation of their thought in the language of our own time will not lessen our sense of the debt we owe to them for the contribution they have made towards a solution of the problem ' (p. 95 f.).

Rather than work through Part I of Dr. Relton's book, it may be well to try to make clear what were the ancient terms and what solution was offered, or rather what were the accepted conditions of solution. The general metaphysic of the Conciliar period was still Aristotelian, and theologians for the most part accepted it. It led to precision in reasoning, and was very serviceable for the exposing of erroneous argument. It may be remarked that though modern science and philosophy reduce the universe to somewhat different terms, the old terms nevertheless can be brought into one-one correspondence with other terms or sets of terms, and the act of so doing may be the surest way to test the validity of some newly stated theory : if it cannot stand logical analysis when transformed into the old terms, it is probably defective.

Every distinct object which is manifest to our senses and which we have reason to suppose is a

real existence exists because there is something real and ultimate underlying the manifestation, something which we name its *ousia*. This may be defined as the thing which it really is in itself, regardless of being known and interpreted. Ousias come into two great divisions : the ousias of all created things, which came into existence because ' God said . . . and there was,' and the ousia of God Himself. Ousia is often translated *essence*, in which case it is very important to remember that it means what the thing ultimately is. Ousias can combine, divide and change, in which case they become different ousias : the ousia of hydrogen combines with the ousia of oxygen and produces the ousia of water. Water is not a mixture of the ousias of hydrogen and oxygen ; it is the compounding of those ousias into a new ousia. To each ousia pertains a *nature*, which is the sum total of its properties and qualities. Obviously there cannot be a nature without an underlying ousia, nor can we conceive an ousia without a nature, for in that case there would be nothing by which to know it. Ousia and nature thus closely interdepend, and one presupposes the other ; but it is a great error to regard them as synonymous, and much muddled thinking has resulted from inability to realize the distinction. When two ousias combine to form a new ousia, their two natures necessarily combine to form a new nature.

At first exactly a synonym of ousia, the word *hypostasis* acquired two shades of meaning. First, it was used in preference to ousia in relation to human beings : we speak of the hypostasis of a man rather than of his ousia. But there is no difference in significance. The hypostasis of a man is that which he really is, that which underlies what we see and know, that which is the reality of him. It is to be noted that this includes the whole man, body, soul, and spirit (if we adopt the tripartite analysis). It will at once be seen that hypostasis is by no means the same concept as *person*. Rather does it emphasize the unity and totality of the individual human being. You are a man if you have a human hypostasis, a comprehensive unity including all that pertains to manhood. The idea of unity is very important. Second, the word hypostasis acquired a special signification in reference to the Holy Trinity. The unity of the Godhead was expressed by postulating that It was one ousia, one essence. However God is experienced, it is an experience of the one ousia of Deity : the totality of Godhead is uniform and consistent. But the totality of Godhead eternally exists in three simultaneous complementary phases, alike sustaining Its inner harmony and Its outer functioning. These three phases are named hypostases. They are indistinguishable one from the other in ousia, and are indeed inseparable complements one of another in constituting that ousia. It will readily be seen how poor and inadequate a word ' person ' is for describing these hypostases.

The Incarnation consisted in one of these hypostases, that whose characteristic is Filiation, the Word, becoming Man for our salvation. To do this involved at least working through a human body (Apollinarianism) or through a complete man (Nestorianism). But to use a human body is not to be Man, as Gregory of Nazianzus quickly pointed out ; and for Deity to use a man as His agent is for the Saviour to be a dual personality, as Cyril saw so clearly. To be God, the Saviour must have Divine nature, which pertains to the Divine hypostasis. To be Man, the Saviour must have human nature, which pertains to a human hypostasis. To be a unity He must have but one hypostasis. We must not here pursue the subtle metaphysical intricacies of the problem, but must indicate as briefly as possible the solution which was reached, to a great extent by the insights of Cyril of Alexandria, the Council of Chalcedon, and Leontius of Byzantium. Christ must possess all that pertains to manhood, that is, He must possess a distinct human nature ; He must possess all that pertains to Deity, that is, He must possess a distinct Divine nature. These two natures must not be combined : that would produce a *tertium quid* which would be neither. But natures inhere in ousias, hypostases. Christ must therefore possess both a human and a Divine hypostasis. But that gives a dualism. The natures, then, must be retained separately while the hypostases unite—hypostatic union. This was Cyril's way of cutting the Gordian knot. But since absorption into deity means the virtual disappearance of the human hypostasis (even if we can concede such a combining), the human nature is left without its own distinct hypostasis, that is, is anhypostatic. This is not a solution without considerable merit : the Word became Flesh, there never being (to use the modern term) any personality other than that of the second hypostasis of the Trinity, but that personality had two natures, the human and divine, and knew what the tension between them meant. Leontius of Byzantium, with deeper insight than he perhaps realized, took one more step : the human nature in Christ is not left without a hypostasis, anhypostatic, but its hypostasis, the less, is within and perfected by the greater, so that the human nature of Christ is ' within the hypostasis,' that is, is enhypostatic in His Divine hypostasis.

Thus did the ancients declare their conviction of faith that Jesus Christ was truly God, truly Man, truly One. They had not solved the problem, but they felt assured that in some such terms as these the solution was to be sought or to remain for ever

hidden. Far from representing the 'bankruptcy of ancient theology' as some have sneered, the Chalcedonian Definition, rightly understood, stands like a rock asserting alike against the sceptic, the feeble in faith, and gnostics of all generations, what are those criteria by which all-committing faith in Christ stands or falls: 'Following therefore the Holy Fathers, we all with one voice teach to confess one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, the same perfect in manhood, the same truly God and truly man of a reasonable soul and body, consubstantial with the Father as to the Godhead and the same consubstantial with us as to the manhood, like unto us in all things except sin; before the ages begotten of the Father as to the Godhead, and the same in the last days, for us and for our salvation, of Mary the Virgin the God-bearer as to the manhood, one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, acknowledged in two natures, unconfusedly, immutably, indivisibly, inseparably; the distinction of the natures by no means being taken away by the union, but rather the peculiarity of each nature being preserved and concurring in one prosopon and one hypostasis, not parted or divided into two prosopa, but one and the same Son and Only-begotten, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ; according as the prophets taught concerning Him from the beginning, and as the Lord Jesus Christ Himself taught us, and as the Creed of the Fathers has delivered to us.'

In the second and third parts of his book, Dr. Relton examines modern criticisms of the ancient Christology and modern attempts at solution, and relates the idea of enhypostasia to the context of modern thought. We must not take space in recounting how Dr. Relton indicates the reasons prompting the modern approaches and the weaknesses inherent in many of them. Apart from attempts to assimilate the results of modern knowledge, in many cases prematurely, one factor discernible in case after case is the infection of theologians by the germ of scepticism, so characteristic of our time and so fatal to the consideration of egregious phenomena: 'When, for example, we are told that it is unthinkable that Godhead and manhood should be united in a single person walking upon the earth, it is legitimate to question the presuppositions on the basis of which the Liberal critics set out to examine the New Testament portrait, and we speedily find that the real difficulty is an *a priori* "psychological impossibility" of the Two Natures of Christ, which vitiates the whole treatment of the subject, and leads to the inevitable conclusion' (p. 108).

It is when he comes to relating the doctrine of enhypostasia to modern knowledge and criticism that Dr. Relton shows both the richness of the theory and the acuteness of his ability to relate it to modern insights. The argument in this section cannot fairly be briefly summarized. The main thesis, however, seems to be this: humanity at its highest and best is implicit within Godhead, and, in consequence, human nature does not come to its true expression and perfection otherwise than in ever closer oneness with Godhead. Only, then, in Christ, where by enhypostasia this oneness exists, shall we find manhood at its highest. So the doctrine of enhypostasia not only gives an approach to the mystery of Christ's Person, but also gives the only revelation of what manhood can really be: 'Without God human personality is incomplete, and . . . He alone can supply it with that which alone can help it to its full realization' (p. 186). 'Only so far as He was at every moment truly Divine could He have been at any moment truly human. Far from His transcendence destroying the possibility of His living a truly human life, it is the necessary presupposition without which the latter were an impossibility. Only because He was the unlimited Logos in His Incarnate state could He be the Ego of a perfect manhood in every conceivable relationship in which that manhood stood to those with whom He came into contact' (p. 221). Similarly the Incarnation gave expression to the perfect humanity implicit within Godhead: 'The Divine Logos, prior to the Incarnation, already possessed everything needful to enable Him to live a truly human life. . . . His advent, therefore, in the flesh brought to the human nature He assumed, not an alien element such as would render a truly human life for the God-Man an impossibility, but just that which alone could make the life of Christ in every stage of its growth and development a truly and perfectly human life. The Divine Logos was capable of being the Ego, not only of His Divine but also of His human Nature; because His Personality in virtue of its Divinity already embraced all that is most distinctive of a truly human personality. The human and the Divine are not two contradictory, but two complementary terms, and the less is contained in the greater. His Divine self-consciousness was, in virtue of its Divinity, a truly human self-consciousness. His Ego was Divine—it was also human; therefore it could be the subject of both natures' (p. 226 f.).

This fine passage partakes of some of the character of the Chalcedonian Definition itself: we cannot perhaps quite comprehend how these things can be; but conviction grows that somewhere here is the chink through which further light will come. Others of us have striven with this same problem, and though the mode of approach may have been a little different, there is the same conviction that the key to the problem lies in some deep and glorious fundamental possibility of union between

ourselves and our Maker, which is the ultimate objective of our redemption and which Christ not only obtains but prefigures. Do we not feel this here and now? 'Our examination of religious experience confirmed the fact that man was never more truly man than when his personality was united to God, and when, as the result of the union between the soul and God, the Divine was pouring itself into the human. Paul was never more truly Paul than when his life was hid with Christ in God' (p. 229).

Dr. Relton is not unaware of the reality of the problems which the Kenotic theory seeks to solve, nor does he allow Christological theory to prejudice an open-minded approach to the data of the New Testament. He maintains that the doctrine of enhypostasia fits the facts without need to distort them: 'The Gospels, then, reveal the Christ as having lived a truly human life, perfect at every stage of its growth and development. Our Christology enables us to accept this picture with the fullest possible frankness. Every limitation which the Son of Man can be shown to have lived under, every detail of a circumscribed existence to which Kenotic Christology has drawn our attention, including, of course, the fact of Christ's human knowledge being limited, . . . we can accept without hesitation. All that is involved in the Christ's possession, not simply of intelligence, but of intelligence moulded by a certain training and education as a Jew, and which was circumscribed within the limits of the scientific knowledge and mental equipment of the age in which He lived, we can accept as the necessary conditions essential to His human life, if that is to be described in any sense as an historical reality, and if we are to regard Him as a Man Who lived at a particular time and in a particular environment' (p. 246 f.).

We must not go into this subtle matter deeply, but it is right to state that Dr. Relton is aware of and does not avoid certain philosophical difficulties, notably the fact that his view seems to imply a particular embodying its own universal. In fact, a short article like the present is bound to give an unsatisfactory presentation of a profound and complicated work, to raise questions there is no space to answer, and to remove much of the refinement even from the arguments which are quoted. But a work of this kind proves that the ancient approach has by no means become outworn. The travail of those early centuries arrived at results of deeper significance than their framers knew, and staked the irreducible claim for a faith that can continue to produce martyrs.

Literature

THE SUB-STRUCTURE OF NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY

We ought to be grateful that Professor C. H. Dodd did not lay down his pen along with his Chair. His latest book, *According to the Scriptures* (Nisbet; 10s. 6d. net), being the Stone Lectures given at Princeton in 1950, exhibits again the wide range of his scholarship and sheds notable light on the use of the Old Testament in the New.

Sixteen years ago Dodd reconstructed for us 'the ground-plan' of the New Testament theology, namely, the *kerygma*. A chief plank in it was the statement that in the gospel events 'the scriptures were fulfilled.' What scriptures did the apostolic preachers have in mind, and how did they use them? These questions Dodd sets himself to answer: he is concerned with what he calls 'the sub-structure' of New Testament theology.

Seeking an answer to the first question, Dodd begins by unearthing fifteen primary Old Testament proof-texts, or *testimonia*, which (he shows) were currently used in the pre-literary period of the gospel tradition to elucidate the main themes of the *kerygma*. Next, he studies these testimonies in their scriptural contexts to see whether the chapters containing them (Is 6, Ps 22, Jer 31, etc.) belonged to the scriptural sub-structure of the *kerygma*. Clear evidence emerges to support an affirmative answer. The first Christians, it would appear, selected certain portions of Old Testament scripture (for example, Jl 2–3, Hosea, large tracts of Isaiah, and many Psalms) which they understood as *wholes*, and from which they quoted particular verses as pointers to the whole context. These passages were used to illuminate the central themes of the earliest preaching—the claim that the New Age had begun, that the Church was the new and true Israel, that Jesus was the Servant of the Lord, and so on.

Now, the method (thus discovered) of interpreting the Old Testament in relation to the *kerygma* betrays a coherent and creative approach to the Old Testament. Who was responsible for it? The earliest preachers in the period of the oral tradition? Yes, partly; but partly also Jesus Himself. 'I can see no reasonable ground,' writes Dodd, 'for rejecting the statements of the Gospels that He pointed to Psalm 110 as a better guide to the truth about His mission and destiny than the

popular beliefs about the son of David, or that He made that connexion of the "Lord" at God's right hand with the Son of man in Daniel which proved so momentous for Christian thought; or that He associated with the Son of man language which had been used of the Servant of the Lord, and employed it to hint at the meaning, and the issue, of His own approaching death.'

Having discovered the main scriptures employed, and the principles governing their selection, Dodd proceeds to show that the basic ideas of Christian theology stem from this scriptural sub-structure. Thus, to explain the early Christian title of 'Lord' for Jesus, we do not need to invoke the Greek mysteries; the usage goes back to the primitive Christian use of Ps 110^1; which in turn depends on Jesus' own hint in Mk 12. This is but one example from a masterly chapter in which the roots of the New Testament doctrines of the Church, the Person of Christ, and the Atonement are all found in this pre-Pauline application of the Old Testament scriptures to the gospel facts.

The final chapter argues that the primitive Christian use of the Old Testament to elucidate the *kerygma*, so far from being a kind of pious fortune-telling, was based on the same principles as the prophetic view of history. It is 'not only consistent and intelligent, but it is also founded on a genuinely historical understanding of the process of the religious history of Israel as a whole.'

This bald summary does no sort of justice to Dodd's lucidly stated thesis. His argument seems to me substantially sound. Those of us who had accepted Rendel Harris's theory of a primitive Christian testimony book will find, I think, that Dodd's theory fits the facts much better. The pre-Pauline *paradosis* quoted in 1 Co $15^{3ff.}$ claimed that the atoning death and resurrection of Christ were 'according to the scriptures.' Thanks to Dr. Dodd we now know better what these four words imply.

A. M. HUNTER

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Too often, in the theological mis-education which we endured, Church History was either disembodied or dismembered. The first happens when we read of the Church as though it were apart from the background of secular events. The second happens when we make the early centuries the prelude to a leap of a thousand years and rebegin on the eve of the Reformation. Here is a work—*The Shorter Cambridge Medieval History*, by the late Dr. C. W. Previté-Orton (Cambridge University Press; 2 vols., 55s. net)—which may serve as corrective to both these ills that theologues are heirs to. It includes Church History in the history of the times, and with due prominence. And the times begin with the accession of Constantine and go on to the Renaissance. The book is enlivened with 265 illustrations, 26 maps, and 17 pages of genealogical tables. Compared with the whole shelf-ful of 'The Cambridge Medieval History' these two volumes are in scope and price within the reach of all, and are written with the general reader in view rather than the specialist historian.

In Volume I the chapters which deal with Gregory the Great, and with the Carolingian renaissance struck me as the most vivid. Volume II begins with subjects of vital importance to Church History—Pope Innocent III, the Friars, and the Inquisition, and capably reviews the Great Schism and the Conciliar Movement. The work ends with eight pages of 'retrospect,' an attempt to see something of meaning in the more-than-millennium surveyed. This I found not wholly satisfying. For example, 'After finality came the transition' (p. 1118) was a sentence which left me wondering. Yet some such taking of stock is needed at the end of the volumes, since large parts of them are closely crammed catalogues of facts, with all too little space for facts' interpretation.

If a criticism lurks here, it is criticism of the choice of policy. In writing the short history of a long period, shall one try to bring in all the facts, or deal more fully with a selection? Dr. Previté-Orton clearly said Yes to the first, and, as clearly, said No to the second. Within the policy chosen, one can acknowledge his high measure of success. My notes show only two omissions about which I cared: the large part played by English missionaries in the conversion of Scandinavia (ch. 15), and adequate exposition of *De Civitate Dei* (completed, surely, in 426, not 430). To attempt a one-page (124) summary of the latter was too ambitious, or (should we say?) too parsimonious. St. Augustine's philosophy of history is, both by its use and by its abuse, the key to the understanding of most that happens between Church and State in the Middle Ages, as return to the subject on pp. 940 ff. acknowledges. As a full summary of facts, this shorter history, like its long predecessor, will be an invaluable book of reference. Choice of the other policy might have made it livelier reading, and more significant as a survey.

In two regards, namely illustrations and style, this attractive book ought to have been further enriched. The illustrations are lavish indeed, but not all are well chosen. Magna Carta, for example, is so small that its writing might be mistaken for hemstitching on a petticoat, and the head of Alcuin from a medieval manuscript is hardly portraiture. The value of almost all the pictures would be multiplied if given a brief note. For example, the Shetland Broch and the Norwegian *Stavkirke* both need relating to the printed matter

of the book, and such pictures as Andrea da Firenze's 'Glorification of the Dominican Order' is full of historical value, most of which will be missed unless it is pointed out. Perhaps the publishers may remember this for the second edition.

Style is more difficult to repair. The adjective 'barbaric' must occur almost as many times as there are pages in Volume I. Both volumes show a preference for abstract terms, and both are marred by awkward expressions—'It would be incredulous to deny that . . .' (p. 13), 'foundations ineradicably weak' (p. 457), [the barons'] 'merited distrust of John' (p. 722). The following seem more like schoolboy howlers than professorial English—'He murdered the queen in the teeth of her patron Justinian's remonstrances' (p. 190); 'He was compelled with his sons to become a monk' (p. 308); 'The new dukes were his eldest son by his English Queen, Liudolf, and his brother Henry' (p. 432); 'France was moulded by feudal institutions which it dominated' (p. 782); 'Clement V was sickly, squeezable . . .' (p. 836).

JOHN FOSTER

BIBLE KEY WORDS

Two more articles from Gerhard Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, translated by the Rev. J. R. Coates, are now available. They are Professor K. H. Rengstorf's very valuable article on *Apostleship* and Professor Rudolf Bultmann's important and interesting discussion of *Gnosis* (A. and C. Black; 7s. 6d. net each). Rengstorf examines the use of ἀπόστολος in Greek usage, in Jewish writings, and in the New Testament. He also discusses 'Christian Apostleship' and 'Jesus as Apostle.' He shows that among Greek-speaking Jews the word appears to have had little currency, and illustrates fully the use of *shaliach*, its nearest parallel, in Rabbinic Judiasm, in its legal, ecclesiastical, and prophetic aspects. 'The Rabbis,' he says, 'summed the situation up in the frequently quoted words, "the one whom a man sends is the equivalent of himself" (Ber. 5, 5), *i.e.*, the sent is as good as the sender so far as the commission is concerned.' The immense importance of this principle is manifest to all who are interested in the question of Apostolic Succession and have followed recent discussions in 'The Apostolic Ministry,' edited by Dr. K. E. Kirk, and in T. W. Manson's 'The Church's Ministry.' Rengstorf's essay, however, contains far more than the study of linguistic usages. He holds that the origin of apostleship must be associated with Jesus, and gives special attention to the action of Jesus in the sending out of the Twelve, pointing out that one should avoid the word 'office' in this connexion and use 'commission' instead. The idea of an office, it is contended, is contradicted by the fact that obviously the commission ended with the return to Jesus. Subsequently, in both Matthew and Mark, the word 'disciple' is always used. 'This excludes the possibility that these evangelists regarded the apostleship as an office with an indelible character.'

Bultmann's article on *Gnosis* draws attention to the wide currency of Gnostic doctrines taught outside and within the Early Church, which, he submits, have to be taken into account in interpreting the whole of the New Testament and the Greek versions of the Old Testament. He shows that the three main characteristics of Gnosticism are its emphasis on the knowledge of God, on knowledge as a gift of God, and on knowledge as power whereby the Gnostic is endowed with the Divine nature and, primarily, with immortality. The presence of Gnostic influence in Hellenistic Judaism, in Philo, and in early Christian usage is traced in detail. How penetrating it was, in Bultmann's opinion, is seen in his treatment of the Synoptic logion, Mt 11^{27}=Lk 10^{22}. 'This verse,' he says, 'presents us with Gnostic language, and the question of its authenticity must be discussed on the analogy of that of the relation between the Johannine and the Synoptic reports of the words of Jesus' (p. 51 f.). How crucial are the issues raised will be seen from this quotation. Whether one agrees with Bultmann or not, this scholarly study is indispensable to the serious student of the Gospels and Epistles.

VINCENT TAYLOR

THE PROBLEM OF TIME

In *The Fulness of Time* (Nisbet; 15s. net), Professor John Marsh has made a valuable contribution to the Christian understanding of history, time, and eternity. His theme is one which is, rightly, arousing increasing attention. One is reminded of the extent to which it has been developed in recent years by Professor Marsh's statement that it was the late A. E. Taylor who first led him to the study of the problem of time. A. E. Taylor was, as Dr. Marsh says, a great teacher and philosopher. He was also a devout Christian. Yet it is hard to imagine him setting out to find what Biblical and Hebraic as distinct from Greek thought has to say about history, time, and eternity. It is just this that Professor Marsh has done and done well.

Particularly valuable in the book are Professor Marsh's treatment of *'eth* or *kairos* as a concrete time sent by God, to which an appropriate human response is demanded and his appreciation of the importance of the Exodus. His analysis of the Biblical idea of the fulfilment of time is important not only in itself but for the bearing which it has

on the relation between Old and New Testaments —a subject which even those who disagree most strongly with Dr. Vischer can hardly afford to neglect since the publication of the latter's 'Christuszeugnis des Alten Testaments.'

Dr. Marsh carried on his study in independence of the work done by Professor Cullmann on the same theme, but in an appendix he takes note of the views expressed in 'Christ and Time.' His main criticism is that Professor Cullmann goes astray when he interprets Biblical concepts of time in a chronological sense. Not every one will agree with Dr. Marsh here. And at least one reader would like a fuller discussion of his final conclusions and in particular of the part which the Resurrection of Christ plays in them. But he has produced a book which any future student of the subject would be extremely unwise to neglect.

IAN HENDERSON

GOD AND THE WORLD

In his book, *God and the World* (Allen and Unwin; 10s. 6d. net)—which might have been longer with advantage—the author, Emeritus-Professor Thomas Miller Forsyth, M.A., D.Phil., has brought together several separate studies in the history of philosophy, but has welded them by means of the principle suggested in the title. He has further indicated his general attitude by fittingly reproducing in appendices extracts from two former articles, in one of which he stresses the point that the human consciousness belongs to an infinitely larger and greater whole, and, in the other, expounds the essential idea of 'Holism,' bringing out its superiority to mechanistic explanations and its avoidance of the danger of 'reading down' the higher into the lower in certain modern systems of philosophy. He here finds a solid basis for a criticism of materialism, behaviouristic psychology and emergent evolution, and his position is not dissimilar to that of the late Archbishop Temple. The four chapters which form the main part of the book are historical, and that on Plato is particularly useful, especially in the explanation given of the essential meaning of the theory of ideas and the doctrine of reminiscence. The former, it is urged, is not the keystone of Plato's philosophy, which is more significantly to be found in the primacy of spirit. An interesting distinction is drawn between myth, which is held to be integral to Plato's system, and allegory, the former breaking new ground and the latter simply clarifying what is already known. The exposition of Aristotle does not seem so valuable but the author's own summarizing chapter on recurring problems suggests a rehabilitation of the somewhat chilling doctrine of the 'Unmoved Mover.' In this connexion use is made of the idea that in any perfected state 'all *effort* both of will and intellect shall cease, while *activity* reaches its highest point.' The chapter on Spinoza gives a fresh and attractive presentation, and the accounts of Bergson, Lloyd Morgan, Alexander, and other moderns are both sympathetic and critical. Professor Forsyth justly appreciates their efforts to reconcile the two aspects of being and becoming, of eternity and time. His own way of expressing the reconciliation would be to say that eternity is the truth of time, in the sense that 'the consciousness of eternity is apprehension of the abiding significance of everything that happens, with however brief a duration, as an event in the temporal process.' In his concluding pages, which are of great beauty and harmonize with the character of the book as a whole, he reaches the conclusion that God is best defined as Infinite Love, and adds that 'this conception alone seems capable of meeting alike the requirements of philosophical construction and the needs and claims of morality and religion.'

W. S. URQUHART

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST EVIL

Principalities and Powers, Studies in the Christian Conflict in History, by the Rev. E. Gordon Rupp, M.A., B.D. (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net), is not so much a theoretical treatment of the problem of evil as a directing of the Christian artillery in the midst of the battle. It analyses man's failure of nerve in the contemporary struggle against evil with insight and sympathy. Over against this is set the devout heroism of the Biblical attitude. The source of Christian courage lies first of all in its full recognition of the reality and persistence of evil. Therefore it is not subject to the disillusionment which besets the more facile secular eschatologies in the face of the continual set-backs of history. But above all its strength lies in the faith that though the battle continues with a confused noise, the decisive event of history has already occurred in Jesus Christ, and in the present knowledge that grace prevails over sin.

Mr. Rupp argues his case with characteristic Lutheran fervour balanced by scholarly judgment. He is led, however, by a very justifiable pride in his own Methodist communion to make for it historical and theological claims which some would wish to modify, though none could deny them outright. This in spite of evident and courteous endeavours to be fair to other communions. There are few men who can rival Gordon Rupp's gift for combining literary artistry with theological profundity. It is a delightful as well as a helpful and encouraging little book.

ALLAN D. GALLOWAY

SCOTTISH QUAKERISM

About the middle of the seventeenth century Quakerism 'invaded' Scotland. An admirable account of its early triumphs and tribulations, and its decline in the eighteenth century is given by the Rev. George B. Burnet, M.A., Ph.D., F.S.A.Scot., Minister of Corsock, in *The Story of Quakerism in Scotland 1650–1850* (James Clarke; 15s. net). Dr. Burnet's book is the result of great research, and is not likely to be superseded. He writes well and with sound judgment.

The story as he unfolds it is rather pathetic. Quakerism was exotic in Scotland, yet in its days of persecution it won not a few outstanding adherents in all walks of life. It could show scholars like George Keith and Robert Barclay. It could organize a colonial mission in New Jersey. It established a few schools in the North-East.

Dr. Burnet writes sympathetically enough of the Friends, but does not conceal his belief that for their persecution they were themselves frequently in no small measure to blame. They 'invaded' parish churches during Divine Service and interrupted; while they were no whit behind their critics in the violence of their controversial language. So, too, he shows that a main cause of their decline was the 'Quietistic' lethargy which cessation of persecution induced, their absurd regulations as to dress and their prohibition of nearly every form of recreation.

The book is adequately documented and amply supplemented with a very full bibliography and excellent indexes.

An Epilogue dealing with the Quakers in Scotland down to the present day is supplied by Mr. William H. Marwick, M.A., Clerk to the Friends' General Meeting for Scotland.

On p. 142 'protagonist' seems to be a mistake for 'antagonist'; it seems, too, to be the only mistake in the book. W. D. Niven

---

'A new religion has come into history—that is Western Vedanta,' so Mr. Gerald Heard begins his essay. Perhaps.

In any case, here comes a rather pretentious volume—*Vedanta for Modern Man*, edited by Mr. Christopher Isherwood (Allen and Unwin; 25s. net). It consists of about seventy essays, some of them very slight and short, some of them longer; and not all of them closely related to their titles. The editor recommends that we begin with these three—'Vedanta and Western History.' 'Is Vedanta for the West?,' and 'Western Vedanta.' The mass of the contributors are not known to most of us. But some are notable—Nehru, Radhakrishnan, Vivekananda, and the like. There is more than enough of Aldous Huxley, who is not at his best.

In this beautiful little book, *Church Organ Accompaniment* (Canterbury Press; 9s. 6d. net), Mr. Marmaduke P. Conway, formerly in charge of the music in Ely Cathedral, gives simple, clear, exact, good advice on technical matters in connexion with the use of the organ and the training of choirs, with special reference to the Psalter, *The Messiah* and *Elijah*, and with detailed suggestions about the employment of stops. It is refreshing to note how a professorial musician of high accomplishment is constantly moved by the desire to enjoin what will be practically possible and a help to general co-operation in worship.

One is amused by the recommendation with regard to one of the cursing Psalms still sung in their rota—'the interpretation should be quiet and as Christian as possible.' At Ps 107 the chance might have been taken to point out that with the refrain must always be included the first verse after it; the new stanza, it should be marked in reading as in singing the Psalm, begins at the second verse after the repeated words. The idea of taking 'Onward Christian Soldiers' in two time rather than four is excellent. Though not suggested here, the same treatment removes the danger of dragging drawl in hymns like 'Peace, perfect peace' and 'Saviour, again.'

This is an admirable book for any organist to keep for frequent reference.

The texts of Miss Phyllis L. Garlick's *Man's Search for Health*: A Study in the Inter-Relation of Religion and Medicine (Highway Press; 15s. net) are really those on pp. 183–184: 'Christianity came into the world not only as a religion of healing but as a triumphant message of newness of life; of health for the whole man.' 'The early Christians were inspired by a sense of wholeness in their mission to the world. They believed that that new quality of life which Christ came to impart was to extend to the whole of man's being—body, soul, and spirit. Thus from the outset the ministry of healing was considered to be as integral a part of the Church's work as the ministry of Word and Sacrament with which it is fundamentally linked.' It is a wide-flung volume, starting with 'From Magic to Medical Science,' and dealing with African, Indian, and Chinese Cultures, and then with 'The Christian Valuation of Human Life,' 'The Church's Ministry of Healing,' 'Fresh Meeting Points between Religion and Medicine,' and 'Towards a New Synthesis.'

Basil of Cæsarea founded 'probably the first leper asylum to be built.' 'The first general hospital in the West was founded in Rome about A.D. 400 by a Christian woman named Fabiola.' 'A new era of nursing opened with St. Vincent de Paul.' 'Mrs. Fry founded the first institution for

the training of nursing sisters in this country.' 'Christ,' said Florence Nightingale, 'was the author of the nursing profession.'

The Faith We Preach By, by the Rev. E. C. Blackman, M.A., B.D. (Independent Press; 8s. 6d. net), is a little book which will be helpful to the Lay Preachers and untrained Bible students for whom it is intended. Its chief merit is that it raises most of the right questions for the beginner and displays something of the balanced structure of Christian dogmatic. The book also contains a fair amount of apologetic material. Perhaps the student would have been better served if this space had been devoted to a fuller exposition of the dogmatic material which the Foreword claims is the main concern, and to a fuller explanation of some of the technical terms which the author is forced to employ.

In view of the Seventh International Congregational Council due to meet in St. Andrews next June two addresses by the late P. T. Forsyth have been republished under the title *Congregationalism and Reunion* (Independent Press; 5s. net). The first paper is on 'Reunion and Recognition' and dates from 1917; the second is on 'Congregationalism and Reunion' and came a year later. A good deal of water has flowed under bridges since then but Forsyth had the qualities of a seer, and whatever he said on any subject as is now being recognized is still worth very serious consideration. Many of us agree with him that federation must come before corporate re-union, that matters are rather hopeless unless all churches are ready to admit that valid ministries and sacraments really exist outside their own borders, and that unity does not necessarily mean uniformity. Others besides Congregationalists may well read this booklet to their profit.

A Hundred and Twenty Negro Spirituals, with tonic sol-fa music, by Mr. Alexander Sandilands (Livingstone Press), has as its aim 'to make available for my friends the African teachers, pupils, ministers, and people a small but authentic and representative collection of Negro Spirituals.' It is not so very small. The known ones are all here, such as 'Deep River' and 'Steal away to Jesus.' But, says the editor, 'their origin is unique. These are not music "composed" after the manner of ordinary music, but sprang to life, ready made, from the white heat of religious fervour during some protracted meeting in church or camp.' But they mostly deal with The Great Deliverance, The Hope of Heaven, and a Christian heaven at that, and love without Hate which, thinks Mr. Sandilands, is akin to the Suffering Servant of the Lord. Many will agree with this verdict—'One must deplore much of the present-day singing of these songs on the concert platform.'

The title of the Rev. J. Oswald Sanders's book—*Christ Incomparable* (Marshall, Morgan and Scott; 12s. 6d. net)—is a stimulus and a challenge, and Mr. Sanders has responded in a series of doctrinal and devotional studies of the life and work of Christ, marked by intensity of feeling and beauty of expression. The book will be valued by those who adopt the simple and receptive attitude which he advocates. The chapters on 'The Prayer Life of Christ' and 'The Serenity of Christ' are particularly impressive, but we feel that throughout the book the appeal would have been more effective if the language had been more restrained and the use of exclamation marks less frequent. A tendency to dogmatism upon certain disputed points of doctrine is apparent, and the circle of readers would have been widened if speculative inquiry into difficulties had received greater encouragement.

It seems singular that only now is there issued a full-length portrait of one of the seven Bishops—*William Lloyd, 1627–1717*, Bishop, Politician, Author, and Prophet, by the Rev. A. Tindal Hart, M.A., D.D. It is published for the Church Historical Society by the S.P.C.K. and costs 30s. Lloyd played a big part in his times. But he is on the whole not a particularly attractive character. One trait was that, kindly to Dissenters, he was harsh to his own people. As a preacher he had something of a reputation. But his musings on the prophecies in Daniel and Revelation were not wise.

Those interested in architectural archaeology will find in *The Origin and Development of Early Christian Church Architecture*, by Mr. J. G. Davies (S.C.M.; 21s. net), a monogram on the church buildings of the first six centuries which in format and diction as in scholarship is worthy of highest praise. Much of the lavish information deftly gathered into small compass will, like the numerous plans and illustrations, be appreciated fully only by those whose close study of the subject qualifies them to assess its bearing and importance. But in the learned discussion of the evidence adduced about the development of the form of ecclesiastical structures the general reader will find information that undermines any notions about an early period that loved a simple form of worship. The interesting explanation is given for the multiplication of altars in a church that it was due to having a separate altar for the relics of each saint. And one or two early examples are described of the building of something like a 'community centre' round a church.

Science and Religion

The Present Position from a Scientist's Point of View

By Archibald W. Sloan, B.Sc., M.B., Ch.B., F.R.F.P.S., M.R.C.P., The University, Glasgow

I

The relationship of science and religion is a problem as old as science but, as Baillie has pointed out, not as old as religion.[1] It is of contemporary interest in view of a wide-spread feeling among laymen that there is some essential incompatibility between these two modes of thought.

This article is the expression of a layman's point of view on the subject; the point of view of a medical scientist without specialized training in theology. The problem has been approached, as far as possible, on scientific grounds since it is the purpose of the article to indicate that the scientific approach is compatible with religious belief.

In general, science and religion are concerned with different aspects of experience, but there is an overlap: there are aspects of experience, particularly in our observation of the world around us, which can be interpreted in two different ways, according to whether we apply the methods of science or of theology to the interpretation.

II

Scientific theory, like any other, must start with some presuppositions. The two main ones to be assumed in this argument are the reality of sensory experience and the unity of truth.

The first premiss is that phenomena which we observe really exist, in other words that we can believe the evidence of our senses. There are well-known exceptions to this rule, for example optical illusions in which visual impressions are distorted, and also there are the various forms of hallucination which occur in mental disorders. But in a sane individual and allowing for the limitations of the sense organs, which we understand pretty well nowadays, it is reasonable to assume that sensory experience represents real things.

The second premiss is St. Thomas Aquinas's proposition that truth is one and indivisible, although it may be approached from various angles. If scientific and religious belief conflict then they cannot both be true.

This raises an important psychological point. We all have in our minds certain logic-tight compartments: in other words we are quite capable of holding at the same time two completely incompatible beliefs. This is an important factor in preserving our peace of mind: if we attempt to reconcile irreconcilable beliefs the mental conflict involved is considerable. We can believe, for example, that God created Adam as a sculptor fashions a statue and at the same time that Adam, if he ever existed, must have evolved by natural selection from some earlier species of man, who in turn evolved from a monkey-like ancestor.

The point to be stressed about our observations of Nature is not that the logic-tight compartments are bad but that they are unnecessary. We should not be afraid to allow free rein to scientific speculation for fear of irreverence or to apply our intellect to religious doctrine for fear of finding it untrue.

In this connexion the vexed question of faith arises. The layman may feel that faith is a weakness of religion: if a thing is true it should be self-evident; anything requiring faith is suspect. Yet the most materialistic scientific work is an act of faith; a faith in order and harmony and a belief that the simplest explanation is the one nearest the truth.

In this article I shall, as far as possible, apply the method of science to the problems of Nature and where Christian belief is touched on it will be as a hypothesis, not as a faith. If we accept Christian belief uncritically, discussion is pointless: on the other hand if we approach it in the scientific spirit it must be with an open mind, prepared to see how it fits the observed facts and prepared to reject it if it does not. The scientific idea of truth is a concept of reality which agrees with observation. We believe in Darwin's theory of evolution or Einstein's theories of relativity because these theories fit in with what we can observe. Similarly even the most materialistic scientist should be prepared to assume provisionally the existence of God in order to see how that theory fits the observed facts.

[1] John Baillie, *Natural Science and the Spiritual Life* [1951], 5.

The scientific approach has several obvious limitations. Science is not concerned with moral values, except to a very limited extent: the scientist as such is concerned with whether a belief is true or false, not with whether it is good or bad. Being human a scientist does make moral judgments too, but he does that as an individual human being, not as a scientist.

Again, science is not, as a rule, concerned with personal relationships. The relationship of the scientist to the material he is studying is impersonal, what Martin Buber calls the 'I-it' in contrast to the 'I-thou' relationship.

This ignoring of ethical and emotional concepts is not in any sense a denial of their importance; it is merely an affirmation that they are not the direct concern of the scientist as such. All the scientist is directly concerned with is the search for knowledge: whether this knowledge is good or bad need not concern him provided it be true.

Although it is not concerned with the moral issues involved in the knowledge it attains, scientific method imposes a very strict moral code on those who practise it. This involves an undeviating quest for truth and a sincere dedication to this ideal. The scientist must load the scales against himself all the time: the more he believes in something the harder he must search for evidence to disprove it. He must be his own *advocatus diaboli*.

We have arbitrarily limited the scope of what is to be called scientific investigation to the observation and interpretation of natural phenomena, but there is a further limitation imposed on us by our own structure, a limitation in what we can observe. Our knowledge of the world around us depends on our sense organs and these are only capable of responding to particular stimuli. The sense organs in our skin, for example, can tell us of contact with objects in the environment, of the shape of these objects, of heat and cold, and of danger in the sense of pain. They cannot tell us of the presence of other objects which neither touch the skin nor radiate heat. Our organs of taste and smell tell us of the presence of particular chemicals in the food we eat and in the air we breathe: they cannot tell us all the substances which are there since many have no taste or smell. The ear tells us of the presence of compression-rarefaction waves of air, which we call sound, but if these have a frequency below twenty cycles per second or above twenty thousand cycles per second our ear does not respond to them and we do not know they are there.

The eye, perhaps the most wonderful of all our sense organs, responds to electromagnetic waves which fall on it, but only if these waves are within a limited range of frequencies: we call these light waves. By special techniques we can detect the presence of electromagnetic waves of higher frequency (ultraviolet waves, X-rays and the electromagnetic component of cosmic rays) or of lower frequency (heat waves and wireless waves) but there are probably waves of higher frequency than cosmic rays which have not yet been detected.

It seems reasonable to infer from these known limitations of sensory experience that our knowledge of Nature must be incomplete. Hamlet might have been addressing a scientist when he said:

> There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
> Than are dreamt of in your philosophy.

It was stated above that science and religion are concerned with different, but not mutually exclusive, aspects of experience. Let us take two subjects about which, thanks to science, we know a great deal, and see whether the Christian hypothesis fits in with the results of scientific investigation. Each of these subjects is vast and all that is possible in a brief space is to indicate current belief in general terms without detailing the evidence for such belief.

III

The first of these subjects is the nature of matter. What is the current belief of the physicists about this?

Our knowledge of the nature of matter has increased dramatically within our own life-time. Only twenty-five years ago school-children were taught: 'Matter can neither be created nor destroyed.' Now we have evidence that, in the universe around us, matter is being both created and destroyed. According to modern astronomers the universe is still in the process of formation and expansion; it is not something made in an instant long ago and never added to since then. Matter and energy, we now find, are to some extent interchangeable; if we take a particle such as an electron and add a vast amount of energy to it in the form of acceleration, as is done in a synchrotron, the particle gains in mass. We have, in a sense, created matter. Similarly destruction of matter occurs in Nature and can even be achieved by man. At least a part of the sun's energy probably derives from annihilation of matter, and the energy of an exploding atomic bomb is that of destruction of matter.

The individual atom is believed to consist of yet smaller particles, heavy particles called protons and neutrons forming the nucleus of the

atom and light particles called electrons rotating round these. The atom has been likened to a solar system with the nucleus as the sun and the electrons as the planets.

Perhaps the most striking thing about the nature of matter is that we are confident of the existence of these nuclear particles, which we have never detected by any of our senses. We deduce their presence from the effects they produce and then we perform experiments designed to reveal any inconsistencies in the theory.

The increased accuracy of observation achieved by physicists in the twentieth century has revealed inconsistencies in previously accepted theories, such as the law of conservation of matter, and Newton's law of gravity, both of which were accepted as expressions of truth for many years because they were consistent with the observations which could be made with the instruments of the time. New explanations are required to explain new and more accurate observations and these in turn must be tested by experiments designed to reveal inconsistencies.

One of the most important physical theories of the twentieth century is Heisenberg's 'uncertainty principle,' which concerns the limitations of precise knowledge of the elementary particles which make up the atom. Broadly speaking it states that at any instant of time we cannot know the exact location and the exact velocity of a moving elementary particle such as an electron. The means used to find its position affect its velocity and the means used to find its velocity cannot show its position. The larger the particle the less is the uncertainty; with objects large enough to be seen or felt the degree of uncertainty is negligibly small and the laws of classical physics appear to hold.

What general principles arise from all this? Physicists have discovered a vast amount of detail about the nature of matter and the nature of the universe in which we live. Fundamental relationships between matter and energy have been discovered and, perhaps the most significant discovery of all, a limit has been found to precision of observation. There is the paradox that with the tremendous increase in accuracy of observation in the twentieth century physics ceases to be an exact science.

Is there anything in these scientific beliefs, confirmed by the evidence of our senses, which conflicts with the hypothesis of God? We find an order in the universe, enough order for us to be able to predict many future events with reasonable accuracy. Without some uniform controlling force it is difficult to imagine how the universe could be so orderly. Our known physical laws do not provide a complete explanation. Then, the Christian theory postulates a creator, who is still active. Modern astronomy confirms that creation is in progress: new galaxies are being formed. If this creation requires a creator then he is still at work. There is no direct evidence of God any more than there is any direct evidence of protons, neutrons, and electrons, but we deduce the existence of these elementary particles from their effects. It would be reasonable for the Christian to adopt the same criterion.

IV

Another major scientific problem is the nature of life. For this, as for matter, the scientist has no complete explanation, but he does know a lot about it. We know the characteristics of life: a living thing grows and reproduces: it takes in food material and builds that material into the substance of its own body: it reacts to changes in its environment.

Animals and plants are made up of individual units called cells. The simplest animals and plants consist of one cell only. The living matter is called protoplasm.

These simplest living things are potentially immortal. An amoeba does not die of old age: it grows progressively until, when it reaches a certain size, it divides into two and both parts continue to grow. There is no death of protoplasm. This process may continue indefinitely unless some accident happens, such as the individual being dried up or eaten by a larger creature. The higher, many-celled animals, including man, pay for their specialization by becoming mortal. The specialized cells wear out and are not replaced. But even in man some cells are primitive and potentially immortal—the germ cells. In the process of reproduction these come together, one from each parent, to form a new individual, who carries in him some of the living protoplasm of both parents. A great biologist, Schäfer, said: 'Man can only gain immortality through his descendants.' [1] Schäfer was quite justified in his claim that man can gain immortality of a kind through his descendants, but he had no valid grounds for claiming that this is the only form of immortality, although it was probably fair to say that it was the only form he personally could comprehend.

We know a great deal nowadays about the nature of the processes taking place in the living cell, the intricate pattern of chemical and physical changes which we call life, and the very delicate adjustments which are constantly performed in

[1] E. A. Schäfer, quoted by Professor E. P. Cathcart in a Lecture at Glasgow [1937].

order to nourish the cell and adapt it to its environment.

The basic structure of protoplasm seems to be the protein molecule. All known living matter is protein in nature and the simplest forms of life, the viruses, are the same size as large protein molecules. Viruses can be changed into apparently inanimate crystals and then changed back into living forms. When we study this very elementary form of life we find that the gap between living and non-living matter is not so great as was once believed.

It has been suggested that the protein molecules which form protoplasm may have arisen by a chance coming together of the various atoms of which they are made up. A simple protein molecule may contain as many as two thousand atoms and these are arranged in a definite order. Statisticians have worked out the probability of chance combination of these atoms giving rise to a protein molecule and the chance is immeasurably small.[1]

These are just a few scientific observations on the nature of life. If we accept them does the Christian hypothesis fit in? Taking first the origin of life, we find that the probability of it being a chance occurrence is extremely remote. The alternative is some sort of 'direction,' and present-day science cannot tell us what this is. If a Christian claims that the regulating force is God, no scientist is entitled, on the available evidence, to deny that claim. Living processes are extremely complex and all this intricate mechanism is integrated in what we call life: this also we can observe but we cannot adequately explain. Finally, death is not an inevitable accompaniment of life, although in highly specialized living things like ourselves it does seem to be inevitable. Science tells us of one kind of immortality. We cannot go so far as Schäfer and claim that this is the only kind.

V

In at least two fundamental fields of knowledge, scientific and religious belief appear to be compatible. Is there then any conflict between these two modes of thought? This question is outside the scope of science, and only a personal point of view can be expressed.

One hundred years ago there was very real conflict between scientific and religious thought. Theologians of the time maintained the doctrine of verbal inspiration of the Bible: if scientists said that the formation of the earth took longer than one week or that different species of animals and plants had evolved progressively over aeons of time, then the scientists must be wrong because the Book of Genesis said something different. When Darwin's great book, *The Origin of Species*, appeared in 1859 it was viciously attacked by churchmen of the time because the theory which Darwin presented of evolution by natural selection was not in accord with current religious doctrine. T. H. Huxley took up the cudgels on behalf of Darwin and the battle between science and organized religion was waged with considerable bitterness on both sides. Finally, under pressure of public opinion, theologians had to accept the new ideas of evolution.

In this connexion it is fair to point out that opposition in this country to the new ideas came mainly from the Anglican and Roman Churches. The Church of Scotland has a creditable record in this respect. As early as 1864 New College, Edinburgh (then Free Church of Scotland), appointed a lecturer in Natural Science, and since then the Church of Scotland has devoted much attention to the study of modern scientific beliefs.

Part of the responsibility for conflict between science and religion in the nineteenth century then seems to have been due to the arrogance of some churchmen in assuming that their own ideas were Divinely inspired and therefore unchallengeable.

Part of the responsibility must rest with the scientists. Here was a great new means of solving the mysteries of Nature. These mysteries were being solved at an astounding speed. Surely everything in Nature could be explained by scientific investigation. This seems to have been the attitude in the second half of the nineteenth century.

And now, half-way through the twentieth century, what is the situation? I believe that both theologians and scientists have learnt a new humility. Old beliefs which have done a great disservice to religion have been abandoned. The Professor of Systematic Theology at Glasgow University says: 'The doctrine of verbal inspiration of the Bible is discredited. The divinity of Christ does not imply divinity of the record of His life.'[2] Scientists are becoming progressively more conscious of the limitations of their knowledge and consequently less dogmatic about their conclusions. The place of science in the world is better defined than it was and we see that it is concerned with only a fraction of total experience.

The reasons for dispute seem to have gone and the time may be ripe for collaboration in these two fields of human endeavour in a joint attempt to seek after truth.

[1] Lecomte Du Noüy, *Human Destiny* [1947], 33–36.

[2] Professor Ian Henderson in an address to a Staff Discussion Group of Glasgow University [1951].

The Ministry of Women

By the Reverend C. E. Raven, D.D., F.B.A., Cambridge

Nothing is more evident in the world of to-day than that radical changes are taking place in the three basic human relationships to which St. Paul refers when he wrote that in Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female. Nothing is more evident in the churches to-day than their inability to recognize or direct these changes. Bodies which profess to proclaim the truth have not yet told us whether our long-term policy on the colour-bar should be a single wholly mixed race or the maintenance of some degree of racial segregation: nor have they with the sole exception of the Society of Friends made any serious effort to tear down or lower the iron curtains that sunder East from West: nor have they given any help adequate to the urgency and importance of the issues to the young men and women who are entering into the new equality of status and freedom of comradeship between the sexes. Indeed in this last, most intimate and most influential of relationships, whereas secular groups have recognized and provided opportunities for the new womanhood, the churches still behave as if their creeds included Milton's edict

> He for God only, she for God in him.

Dr. Kathleen Bliss,[1] in her full and careful survey of the position of women in the churches of forty-five countries, makes this abundantly evident. She has set out in sufficient detail and in ordered and interesting form the facts which characterize the several denominations and the chief geographical areas of Christendom; has explained both the traditional structure and outlook and the changes that recent necessities have produced; and has examined sympathetically and summarized charitably the resulting tragedy. But when all the excuses that she so generously accepts are duly admitted, and when the few signs of improvement are appraised, tragic is the least condemnatory epithet that can be applied to the situation. The churches which should surely have been the first to promote the fuller life to which women have won their way have been slower than any other association—than Parliament, the Trade Unions, those master unions, Medicine and the Law, the Universities, the Army, Navy and Air Force—to admit women into partnership. In spite of their admitted need for all the available resources, in contradiction of their own sacramental theology, in defiance of the duty of enabling the Church to present the fulness of Christ to the world, these societies which proclaim their devotion to their Lord maintain sex-prejudices and prerogatives for which there is no apparent justification except the appeal to tradition.

Dr. Bliss does not find it within the scope of her task to examine the arguments which make the full admission of women to the ministry so plain an obligation. Indeed she is repeatedly willing to strengthen the case for maintaining the present position. She minimizes the breaches of the tradition as in her account of Bishop Hall's action in ordaining a Chinese deaconess to the priesthood (p. 159); she exaggerates the ineffectiveness of women in public life (p. 172 ff.); she barely alludes (p. 198) to the futility and worse of the arguments commonly used against women's admission; she seems too easily content with the belief that the only women who matter are those who are married and have the charge of a home; and she makes no attempt to state or even indicate the fundamental reasons for which many of us deplore the refusal of the churches to recognize the environment in which they are living and to adapt their structure to its requirements.

The three main reasons for the admission of women to the full ministry have been already summarized. They 'belong together.'

The first is, of course, that the Church, now as always commissioned to a task of superhuman immensity and facing at this moment a time of epoch-making opportunity, must in loyalty to Christ see that every available resource is enlisted and used. We hear at home laments of the lack of trained men to carry on the work, of empty churches, feeble clergy, indifferent laymen, and a growing sense of failure; we know overseas how missionary work is restricted, openings unused, men and money insufficient, plans abandoned. Yet any of us who work in schools and universities must know that there is a number of girls and women eager to give themselves to the Christian ministry, to study theology, and to qualify themselves for pastoral and devotional, administrative and homiletic service. And some at least of us know that among them are found women in all respects equal if not superior to men. It is a

[1] *The Service and Status of Women in the Churches* (S.C.M.; 12s. 6d. net).

heart-breaking thing to have to say to such women ' you want to offer your lives to the Church : you can't do it : the Church will not and at present cannot give you any scope for the exercise of your gifts. Go into education, or medicine, or social service and you can find full use for your abilities. Go into church-service and you will be always regarded as subordinate and second-rate. If you say that the meanest service is all that you desire, I reply that it is waste and wickedness to turn a race-horse into a pit-pony.'

Dr. Bliss perhaps naturally hesitates to proclaim the excellence of women's qualifications. It so happens that in the course of my own work I have been associated in each of the four main divisions of ministerial duties—administrative, devotional, prophetic, and pastoral—with women who were in my considered judgment of the highest possible quality. Three of the four are dead ; and lest my claims be thought exaggerated I will mention them.

Lucy Gardner, Secretary with me of the COPEC Conference in the years 1920–25, planned and carried through with very small resources and staff a huge piece of organization. She aroused the interest and won the support of all the churches including until a few weeks before the great Conference in Birmingham the Church of Rome. She issued questionnaires and syllabuses of study for local groups all over Britain. She planned and ordered a Report in twelve volumes covering the whole field of social life. She convened, inspired, and extracted their volume from each of the twelve representative Commissions. She arranged the programme, secured the delegates, organized the meetings, and recorded the findings of the Conference. No man known to me, or (I think) on record, more fully combined a ruthless efficiency with an unerring human sensitiveness : she drove us and herself to the breaking-point to get the work done ; and she called out an affection and loyalty which made the labour a joy.

Evelyn Underhill, so well-known from her books and letters, was in her dealings with human souls, in her insight into the deeps of God, in her exposition of spiritual experience and in her prayer greater even than in her writings. It was my privilege to invite her to take a retreat for clergy. I can never forget the speed with which their resentment was turned into gratitude, as she opened to them the mystery. No man has in that respect given me so much.

Dr. Maude Royden-Shaw, still with us, would be reckoned by any who heard her, among the greatest preachers of recent times. When on a summer afternoon she spoke in the great tent at Swanwick to the hundreds of young men and women fresh from their games on their relationship one to another and on the meaning and splendour of sex, she did what no man could have done ; and for her male hearers at least lifted the whole subject on to a new level.

Beatrice Hankey, ' One called Help,' [1] the most luminous and integrated Christian that I have known who lived out the gospel of wholeness before ever we had learnt to philosophize about it, was to me and to very many others both men and women far more a bishop, a mother in God, than any ordained or consecrated churchman. She knew with an intuition that never faltered the precise significance of one's unspoken need and could meet it with the diagnosis and on occasion the surgery of Divine healing. She was all of a piece, swift to put into the appropriate act what she felt and saw ; ready to demand and to undertake the seemingly impossible ; able to create out of a crowd of individuals a fellowship united organically by the Spirit of God. Her work, her personality, live on.

To deny to such Christians the outward and visible sign and acknowledgment of their ministry is not only to be false to the example of St. Peter and Cornelius ; it is to make unreal the whole sacramental ordering of the Church. Where God's gifts are manifest and effective, the failure to authorize them is not merely a wastage but a denial of the true character of Christian organization. These who have received and exercised an authentic ministry and yet are not suffered to dedicate it to the service of the Church, bring the whole system into disrepute : how can we forbid the sign to those who have manifestly received the Spirit ?

But there is a further principle involved. The Church, if it is the body of Christ fully expressing His fullness of life, cannot do so while it is representative of and controlled by one sex alone. There is in Jesus the perfect quality of man and of woman alike, the paradox of diastole and systole, of individuality and community, of adventurousness and of home-making. An embodiment of the Divine can only be fulfilled in the complete humanity of a man-woman partnership. Until the Church gives true status and scope to both alike, it will not reach a fully Christian level of being : it will remain power-ridden, dualistic, unstable. When at last after these aeons a real partnership in secular affairs is become possible, it is a tragedy that the Church, in which as in Christ there should be neither male nor female, allows itself to be enslaved by its own traditions (and by less worthy motives) and to reject the opportunity now for the first time presented to it.

[1] Her life under this title was published by Hodder and Stoughton in 1937.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Have You Got Your Colours?

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., B.D., Alsager, Cheshire

'He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness.'—Is 61^{10}.

We Britishers are a funny race. We think it strange when foreigners dress up in their native costumes, but the one thing every British schoolboy longs to own is an addition to his wardrobe. I mean that he hopes to get his 'colours.'

I was trying to count up the other day the number of different 'colours' there were at the school I know best. The prefects had a special tie and so had the sub-prefects. There was a school tie, which you could not wear until you had been awarded it for keeping the school traditions in your first term, and there was a tie for each of the four houses. There was a tie for those who represented the school in each sport—cricket, rugger, swimming, athletics, fives, shooting, and chess. The cricket and rugger teams boasted a colours blazer as well, and caps.

And what an honour it was to be awarded one's colours! I remember once that a boy was very ill, so ill that he could not speak to us when we went to visit him in the 'san.' His house decided to give him his colours, and the house captain went over to take him his tie. He pinned it on his pyjamas, and though he could not tell us how glad he was to have it, how proud he looked!

Are we as Christians quite as proud of our colours? I asked a friend who lived on a mission station in the China that used to be, what was the main difference between Christians in China and Christians here. He replied, 'Over there you can tell who are the Christians. They are more cleanly, more helpful, more honest.' That ought to be true of us all. The things that 'are of good report' ought to mark out the people who follow the Lord of all good life.

Have you noticed how often the Bible talks about clothes? At the beginning there is the coat of many colours which marked Jacob's spoiled son Joseph, and at the end there are the armies clothed in fine linen following the one called Faithful and True in the Book of Revelation, and there is much in between. Quite often these clothes are said to be presented by God to men. In our text, for example, the great unknown prophet of the Exile looked forward to the time when the nation should wear the garments of salvation, the robe of righteousness. It would be the example of all the nations. But that was to be God's work, not man's.

In that lies the great difference between the 'colours' the Bible mentions and those we crave at school. We *earn* our school colours for some prowess or skill. But the Bible reminds us that we cannot deserve much from God because we are so often disloyal to His will for us.

We do selfish things, we think more of Number One than of the Other Fellow. We are greedy, smug, bad tempered, and every now and then we realize it. 'Why ever did I do that?' we ask. It is almost as though some lower self got the better of us. Do you remember Paul, writing to the Romans about his own experience?—'What a wretch I am! Who will snatch me away from this living death?' Then he realized. He was thinking without Christ. What God did for us in sending Jesus was to provide an Elder Brother who would make us presentable again—re-introduce us into the family. When the theologians mutter about 'justification by faith' that is partly what they mean.

God, the wisest of Fathers and the kindliest, has given us new 'colours.' We haven't earned them; they are the free gift of His love. But the way we wear them—the way we show how much He means to us—makes possible the progress of His great Kingdom in the hearts of men.

Fluorescent Lighting—and False Teeth

By the Reverend V. J. Abernethy, B.D., West Hartlepool

'And Jesus, perceiving the thought of their heart.'—Lk 9^{47}.

At a Shipping Exhibition held in connexion with the Festival of Britain at Crosby, near Liverpool, a certain firm was displaying the advantages of fluorescent lighting. This is the lighting—in tubular form—which is used to-day in many offices, factories, shops, and also schools.

Around the room were various designs, dresses, and a miniature stage with dummy players upon it, suitably attired. First of all, we were shown the dresses, designs, and stage players under

ordinary electric light. Then that light was switched off and the fluorescent was turned on. The difference was amazing. The dresses and designs and stage players were brought into immediate relief. They seemed to have sprung into life, and the colourings were most attractive.

But fluorescent lighting does not have a similar effect upon everything that it shines upon. This was demonstrated in another part of the same room. The ordinary lights were switched off and a demonstrator placed himself in the path of the concealed fluorescent light and looked at us. All we could see were two rows of gleaming white teeth! We could not even tell whether he was grinning or frowning! Then another demonstrator put himself in the path of the light and looked at us. He revealed two rows of pearly white teeth and a rather hideous face (this was caused by freckles). Another went forward and looked at us. He showed one row of gleaming white teeth. The explanation being that his bottom set of teeth were false, and the fluorescent lighting did not show false teeth up.

This was all intended as good fun, and no doubt it was. But it had its moral as well. False teeth are a very good imitation of natural teeth. They are so well designed that it is difficult to tell whether a person is wearing false teeth or their own. But the fluorescent lighting detects the false teeth immediately. Only natural teeth shine a gleaming white.

How adept was Jesus at exposing the falsity of people's words and opinions. There was a light in Him that revealed whether a person was genuine or not. A man came to Him with the apparently innocent request that Jesus should try to make his brother divide the inheritance with him. Jesus replied sharply, 'Man, who made me a judge or divider over you?' And then, that the people around should not misunderstand, He said, 'Take heed, and beware of covetousness; for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth.' On another occasion His disciples asked Him if they should not command fire to come down from heaven and consume the inhospitable Samaritans. And Jesus, perceiving behind their anger a false sense of the value of man, said, 'Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them.' And they had nothing to say.

This light that comes from Christ may sometimes shine into our hearts, exposing the false, the sham, the artificial. The experience can be very humiliating for us, but also very healthy. And the day may come when we shall be so real and genuine that we shall not fear the light of His Presence. That day is worth striving for.

The Christian Year

SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT

The Secret of Eternal Life

BY PROFESSOR A. M. HUNTER, PH.D., D.PHIL., D.D.,
UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

'And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.'—Jn 17^3.

What is time? What is eternity? The wisest heads in history have pondered these questions. We know that we are creatures of time, and we believe that God belongs to eternity. Our years come and go. God's years do not. If we are creatures of time, can we know anything about God's eternity?

St. John is sure we can. He says he has found the secret of eternal life (that is what his whole Gospel is about), and he wants to share it with others. Let us see if we can follow him.

1. The first point to seize is that there is a difference between 'eternal life' and 'everlasting life.' Everlasting life describes a life that simply goes on and on, like Tennyson's brook. Eternal life is a matter of quality rather than of quantity. It is life of a new kind, life carried into a new dimension, life with the tang of eternity about it. Moreover, this new kind of life can begin even here and now. 'This *is* eternal life,' says St. John, not, 'This will be.'

But the life of eternity in time, here in this fallen world, can this be possible?

Start, then, with a familiar experience. Suppose you are spending the evening in the company of very congenial friends. While it lasts, that time of perfect fellowship, and your enjoyment of it, is steady, all awareness of the past or the future simply falls away. You are lost in an enjoyment which is all present. When, at the end, glancing at your watch, you find it is past midinght, you say, 'My goodness! I never noticed the time passing.' Precisely. In that simple experience you have got above time. It has ceased to matter.

Take a second example, this time from music. In a famous letter Mozart has described for us his method of composing. He tells how, in his imagination, he could overhear his symphonies 'all at once'—simultaneously. 'I don't hear the notes one after another, as they are later to be played, but it is as if, in my fancy, they were all at once.' And he goes on to tell of the happiness which this experience has brought him. 'The actual hearing of the whole together,' he says, 'is the best gift I have to thank my Divine Master for.' Here is another example of a man getting above time—getting through to eternity.

Now take a last example, the classical one of St. Augustine and his mother Monica. Shortly after

his conversion Augustine and his mother were spending one fine evening at Ostia in Italy talking about the deep things of God. And as they talked, Augustine was vividly aware that they had got above time. 'Still higher did we climb,' he says, 'by the staircase of the spirit, thinking and speaking of Thee, and marvelling at all thy works, O God. And as we talked and yearned, we touched the life for an instant with the full force of our hearts.' So deep and intense was the joy of that time that Augustine felt that if it could be prolonged it would be an entrance into the very life of heaven. Here, then, in three examples we have evidence that eternity can enter time, and that man may somehow experience it in advance. Now we begin to understand St. John's 'This *is* eternal life.'

2. But what is eternal life, really? St. John answers: 'Eternal life is knowing Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.' The original Greek is even plainer. 'Eternal life means getting to know Thee the only real God.' Its secret is a growing acquaintance with the only real God, and St. John says this knowledge is to be had by getting to know Jesus Christ, who is God's Messenger to us men.

What does 'knowing God' involve? Does it mean reading many stout volumes of theology? Does it mean mastering the complete works of Thomas Aquinas and John Calvin and Karl Barth? If that were so, then most of us would be condemned to life-long ignorance of God. For few of us have either the time or the mental capacity for that. No, it means something much simpler.

There is all the difference between 'knowing' and 'knowing about.' A five-year-old boy may 'know' his mother better than a twenty-year-old one whose 'knowledge about' his mother's make-up, mental and physical, is far greater—may 'know' her far better in her essential motherliness. Even so, your simple peasant, or fisherman, or shepherd may 'know' God better than the most learned theologian who can discourse impressively about God's existence and attributes.

By 'knowing God' St. John means this—gaining personal experience of God; getting to know Him as one person gets to know another—by keeping company with Him, by meeting Him, spirit with spirit, in trust, and prayer, and sacrament.

So the secret of eternal life is very simple. It consists in getting to know God through Christ who came to reveal Him to us. God dwells in eternity; but in Christ He has come down into our world that we may know Him as a child knows his father. And eternal life is simply getting to know Him thus, and growing day by day and year by year in that saving knowledge.

Do you remember that story of the minister who met the shepherd one day in the hills, and, the talk turning to deeper things, asked him: 'Do you know the Father?' The shepherd went away sadly, for he could not answer the question properly. Years later, when they met again, the shepherd took the first word. 'Sir,' he said, 'I know the Father now.' Isn't that one example of what St. John means?

Let us sum it up. Eternal life is a life of growing acquaintance with Him who inhabits eternity: a life of which Christ is the mediator: a life lived day by day under the eyes of the great Father and in His strength.

'All this—and heaven too.' For if we may experience eternal life in foretaste here and now, it is only beyond death, in God's Paradise, that we may enjoy it in perfection. Then knowledge will turn to sight, and in that sight and in the company of the redeemed will come the full flowering of that life we begin here and now.

My friends, our forefathers thought much about these things. Isn't it time we gave them more attention?

Immersed in the stream of time, busied with 'getting and spending,' all concerned to build our welfare states and paradises on earth, we need to remember that our highest and holiest hopes lie otherwhere; that even now we may begin to taste that eternal life which God has reserved, in its perfection, for those who love Him, beyond the bourne of death; and that the secret of it all lies in getting to know the only real God whose name is Father—knowing Him through Christ, who is His Messenger, God's Messenger to lead us home to Him:

In the hour of death, after this life's whim,
When the heart beats low, and the eyes grow dim,
And pain has exhausted every limb,
The lover of the Lord shall trust in Him.

For even the purest delight may pall,
And power must fail, and the pride must fall,
And the love of the dearest friends grow small,
But the glory of the Lord is all in all.

THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT

The Guerdon of Light

BY THE REVEREND R. J. WATSON MATHEWSON, B.D., S.T.M., EDINBURGH

'Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.'—Eph 5^{14}.

The prayer for light must be one of the oldest prayers in the world. As long as man had light he could feel himself master of his world: he could discern his path: he could see his enemies. The sun was his friend. But with its setting he was left on his own, a prey to the unknown terrors, real or imagined, of the night.

It was natural, therefore, that he should have early adopted light and darkness as among his most important religious symbols. All that light suggested of beneficence, truth, and vision belonged to God 'who coverest thyself with light as with a garment.' Darkness, on the other hand, and all that it denoted of error, ignorance, fear, and evil stood for the absence of God. 'The way of the wicked is as darkness.'

When Jesus came He took over this symbolism and, as He did with so many other things, fulfilled it. He claimed to be Himself the authentic light of the world, the full presence of God; and He promised that henceforth His Church would be the repository of His light. In actual fact that is how it has turned out. Not only has it been through the Church that the generations have seen the light, but also those of its members who have beheld this light and responded to it have experienced a change in character and vitality as radical as is the transformation of night into day.

This change, in fact, was so much part of the experience of the first Christians that they seem to have associated it with the great transformation symbolized in baptism. As the new converts rose from the water they were greeted, evidently, with a hymn which included these words: 'Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.' Included in the grace of baptism was the gift of light.

Our only knowledge of the existence of this hymn comes from Paul's quotation from it in this passage in which he recalls the many implications of the gift of Divine Light; but essentially he has three things to say about it.

1. *The gift of light quickens our perceptions.* The most common activity of light is the revealing of things as they really are. Before we receive the gift of Christ's light we are people of darkness, unreal in ourselves, unable to discriminate competently between the true and the false in the world around us, frightened of the things we need not fear, and careless of those that can truly do us harm. All this because we have insufficient light by which to see. But when we receive that gift then all existence is exposed by it to our view. It shows us things in their true colours.

For one thing it exposes the evil in what may often be mistaken for good. It reveals the essential shabbiness of much that the world hails as brilliant, and the 'dreariness and futility' (J. B. Phillips' translation) of much that it passes offas exciting and significant. For we have this quarrel with sin that it is so hypocritical. Viewed from a distance, it seems entirely desirable and satisfying but known at first hand it turns out so often to be intolerably boring, and if not boring, harassing; for sin and vice and crime notoriously require the cover of darkness; and where concealment is necessary there is always the nerve-wracking fear of exposure. Into all the shadows the light from the Cross penetrates and reveals sin as it really is.

Christ's gift of light also reveals the good in what may often be mistaken for evil. It discloses the activity of God where His presence often goes unsuspected.

To Christless eyes, for instance, suffering may seem senseless and self-sacrifice a waste. But we see the Cross set in the midst of all human suffering; we discern the halo that crowns the martyr's head.

To Christless eyes death may appear the final night which knows no dawn; but we perceive the figure of the Risen Christ supporting the pilgrim through the valley of the shadow. To Christless eyes evil may seem destined to triumph and the whole human story to end in the outer eternal darkness; but we behold the unseen victorious armies of the living God. 'O glory of the lighted mind.'

2. *The gift of light transforms our natures.* 'Whatsoever doth make manifest,' Paul writes in *v.* 13, 'is light.' Modern translations make his meaning clearer. 'Anything that is illuminated turns into light' is Dr. Moffatt's version of the phrase. That is, objects on which light shines assume some of its characteristics: they partake of the nature of light. Light, therefore, does not only reveal, it also transforms.

It shines upon the moist earth and brings from it flowers which in their colour and freshness match its own purity. It changes a sapling into a tree and so stores its energy in every fibre of the tree's substance that aeons later it can be reproduced from the coal in its original warmth and brightness. It soaks into the pavements and walls of an old Italian village till the streets and houses become vibrant with it. It embraces the pallid bodies of invalids and restores vitality and hope.

For light can transform. It can impart something of its own nature to the object it touches. So also can the light which the Christian receives. As we continue to live in the light of Christ's constant presence the transforming work will silently be going on; a time exposure, so to speak, to which we submit ourselves that His nature may be impressed on ours. And according as our lives are purified so also the darkness around us is lightened.

When Jesus said of Himself, 'I am the light of the world,' and then of His disciples, 'Ye are the light of the world' He was not being inconsistent. He knew that His friends could not be unaffected by contact with Himself, and that they in turn would of necessity influence others. Down through the ages that transforming light has been at work

dispelling ignorance, combating doubt and into the darkness of the tomb radiating the Resurrection glory.

3. *The gift of light can be received only when certain conditions have been fulfilled.* Jean Matheson's book, *The Cistern and the Fountain*, closes with a picture of the atheistic doctor rather humbly saying farewell to the clergyman who has been successful in curing a demon-possessed woman in a Scottish village. They are parting at the door of the clergyman's house. 'Keep your faith,' says the doctor. 'Is my hat there? I can't see in this darkness.' 'Here it is,' said Mr. Pearce. 'When you stand in the open doorway with your back to the light, you can see nothing but shadows'

And that is how it is often with us. God's light is not restricted to a few. It is always there, to be possessed by all. If we see nothing but shadows it is because we have our backs to it.

> The angels keep their ancient places;—
> Turn but a stone and start a wing!
> 'Tis ye, 'tis your estrangèd faces,
> That miss the many-splendoured thing.

Our text, therefore, suggests those elementary conditions that must be fulfilled before the light of Christ can flood into our hearts. 'Awake thou that sleepest, arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.' But surely these conditions are impossible? How can a man awake from the depth of his sleep unless he be awakened? How can he rise from the dead unless someone restores him to life? But for that matter how can a withered hand be stretched forth or a paralytic take up his bed and walk? Yet such were Christ's commands.

For here is the great paradox of Christian experience. It is in working out our own salvation that we find Christ working in us. In the act of obedience we are given strength to obey. The light breaks through as we turn towards it.

For living in the light of God is always a compound of His action and ours. We can as little tell where one ends and the other begins as we can discriminate between the volition of the plant and the attraction of the light when a flower turns its face to the sun.

FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT

The Tragedy of Devaluing Jesus

BY THE REVEREND ARTHUR A. COWAN, D.D., EDINBURGH

'And when he had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon. And after the sop Satan entered into him. Then said Jesus unto him, That thou doest, do quickly.'—Jn $13^{26f.}$.

The sop handed to Judas was an affectionate gesture, which reassured him how dear he was to the Master and urged him to reconsider the devaluation of his truest friend. Would this demonstrative touch move Judas before it was too late and shame him out of the foul play he was plotting? It is an ugly business when love is repaid with treachery. Francis Bacon was only a struggling barrister when he was befriended by a powerful patron, the Earl of Essex, who nominated him for high office, favoured him with great kindness and presented him with an estate. Bacon's position was now made, but soon afterwards Lord Essex unmade his own position by revolting against the Government, and Queen Elizabeth was so incensed that she commanded Bacon to conduct the prosecution against him. Bacon did not beg Her Majesty to excuse him from attacking the wonderful friend to whom he owed his present eminence, but conducted the case for the Crown so brilliantly that Essex was sentenced to death and then, after the execution, he published a pamphlet which completely blackened the character of his dead benefactor. Such treachery is the yellow streak in human nature and is often branded as unpardonable. Who could trust such a false creature again?

Well, our Lord took the risk of trusting Judas, and though His fearless love brought Him suffering it also brought salvation to mankind. When Jesus honoured Judas with a tender signal, it revealed His indomitable mercy tapping the potential goodness in Judas, and it proves that Divine love never loses faith even in the faithless, but gives them another chance. Otherwise there would be no gospel for people who have been dishonest with themselves and with others.

Alas! Judas took the sop without feeling that his duplicity was indecent or shrinking from his presumption in gambling with the Master's safety. Jesus had sought to persuade him, but perhaps he asked himself, 'What is the use of persuasion? One cannot govern by persuasion, one can govern only by force, by cowing people and compelling submission.' Judas underestimated the efficiency of Jesus as the founder of the Kingdom of God, and concluded that the new order could not be established by truth but only by terrorism. He believed in ruthless power, which seemed the only way to succeed, and he would not be squeamish about the Master. His Lord did not degrade human personality by intimidation, and did not stoop to it even toward a false friend like Judas, who was conspiring against Him. But Judas surmised it was better to be on the top than to respect human rights and keep troth. Why be trustworthy when it does not pay?

Notice the sequel. 'After the sop Satan entered into him.' When people discard the Christian way of salvation as futile and devalue Christian insights and impulses, what happens? Satan enters into

their mentality, and they become callous, sometimes demonic. Was there not a progressive degeneration in Judas? Whatever double game he was playing, he ended it with a sneer at the Master. Did he not arrange to point out Jesus to the Temple police in Gethsemane by a kiss, as a devoted pupil might kiss the hand of a revered rabbi? To kiss Jesus' hand was thus mock homage, an ironical tribute to His teaching. The covert snigger in the manner of betrayal was so odious to Jesus that He rebuked it. Well might George Eliot comment: 'I refuse to accept a man who has the stomach for such treachery as a hero impatient for the redemption of mankind.' After the sop, the appeal of Jesus had left Judas unmoved. Satan entered into him.

Watch how Jesus condemns dawdling methods. 'That thou doest, do quickly,' He said to Judas. It was now clear that the man was not to be dissuaded from his purpose. Very well then, if he was so determined about it, let him do it at once and get it over as soon as possible. Was our Lord flinching from a prolonged strain? One day Raphael was busy in his studio, when he was summoned to see the Pope, and he rushed off to the Vatican; but he was kept waiting so long in a draughty corridor that he caught a severe chill, went home to bed, and died a fortnight later at the age of thirty-seven. Delay may thus be killing, more than flesh and blood can stand. Was Jesus afraid of collapse? Was He asking to be spared the slow, dragging hours of suspense? Certainly not. To the last, He was more concerned to save Judas than to save Himself, anxious to prevent him from dwelling on the tricks of dissimulation till all moral values seemed valueless. He must not be allowed to sink so low as that, and the sooner he was shocked into a change of mind the better. Let him get the perfidy over and be quit of it, and realize that Divine mercy is following his deluded soul into his self-made hell to nauseate and horrify him, till sick revulsion drives him into the inviting arms of Jesus' forgiveness. Our Lord condemned dilly-dally methods because they would only postpone the disillusionment and repentance of Judas. It was urgent that he should be brought to his senses.

Look! The recoil came swiftly. Once Judas saw his betrayed Master a condemned prisoner, he shuddered at himself, and hurried to implore the priests to take back the blood-money, and ease his sense of guilt. But they refused this relief and made it clear that it was his funeral. In a frenzy of self-accusation he flung the thirty pieces of silver into the inner sanctuary, the Holy of Holies, as if the sacred precincts might purify the filthy lucre. Perhaps he would feel cleaner now that he had given away his ill-gotten gains to the Church—so a sorry wretch may reason. But the storm of self-reproach was not to be so easily stilled, and went on raging till Judas became a total wreck, beyond hope of salvage. He sank in despair, and why? It was his tragedy that he devalued Jesus all through. Thirty pieces of silver, it has been remarked, was the price of the cheapest slave. Was that all that Judas had thought his Lord was worth? Judas had a mental habit of under-rating Jesus, and assumed He was now incapable of coping with such guilt as his.

> Is there not rain enough in the sweet heavens
> To wash it white as snow?

There is not enough rain, but there is enough mercy in Jesus. But Judas did not expect forgiveness, because he under-rated the magnitude of the Master's saving love. He could not believe that the dimensions of Jesus' grace were big enough to include pardon for what he had done. According to Brunner, 'Faith exists in decision, something that must be continually wrestled for and won from unbelief. Faith is not merely passive acceptance but pulling ourselves together in confidence.' But it was the tragedy of devaluing Jesus too long that Judas could not muster sufficient faith and pull himself together in confidence. He went to pieces, and hanged himself.

It was the doom of Judas. This should be recognized by those in our time who devalue Jesus as irrelevant and ineffective in the débacle of modern civilization. Life became unbearable by selling Him as of little worth and betraying 'the vision splendid.'

'That thou doest, do quickly.' Jesus said this meaning to hasten the exposure and defeat of villainy and to accelerate the victory of the Cross which would enthrone Him in human hearts. No sooner had Judas departed to carry out his designs than Jesus exclaimed, 'Now is the Son of man glorified!' He predicted that He would be magnified as the unforgettable Redeemer, not a past love for wistful reverie but a present love by which we can be revived and upheld every day. In Ditteridge village, Wiltshire, stands an ancient, empty house which sighs for a vanished friend in the caption over one of its gateways: 'We can never hear the thrushes sing to-day without remembering'; and yet the desolate house is hopeful, expectant of triumph after tears, and an old doorway bears the words: 'The sun is set, but it will rise again.' Jesus forecast that His day was not over. His day was coming when He would be worshipped as the brightness of the darkest time, because He was God's purpose and power to save the world, God's refusal to let the human race destroy itself by its follies and devilries. Is not that what Jesus Christ is to you and me to-day—the Light which can never be put out by any flood of evil, the Friend who can never be taken away,

the Master of human destiny whose sun is not set but rises again after the blackest night, because the future belongs to Him ?

Passion Sunday

Why the Cross ?

By the Reverend Douglas Stewart, M.A., Pinner

'And it was the third hour, and they crucified him.' —Mk 15^{25}.

1. Who were they ? And what have they to say for themselves ?

The immediate actors on the stage were Roman soldiers doing their duty as part of an army of occupation in Judea. They had crucified other Jews before this One and, doubtless, they would be ordered to crucify others after Him. They were under authority. 'Their's not to reason why.' 'An order is an order and not a basis for discussion.' They won't accept the blame.

So we go to the man who issued the order, Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor. 'This man,' he says, 'had a large following in Galilee, and at the beginning of this week we nearly had a riot here in Jerusalem because of Him. He is politically dangerous. Now they are rioting because they want Him killed. So I can get rid of a dangerous man and pacify the mob by having Him crucified. It is the right thing to do.' And if we say, 'What about justice ?,' he replies, 'Have you ever had to administer an occupied territory—in Asia or Africa or Europe ?'

But, in justice, we recognize that Pilate was a man in a difficult position. 'He that delivered Me unto thee hath the greater sin.' The Romans crucified blindly. So we must turn to His own people. 'Why are you shouting "Crucify Him, Crucify Him" ?' 'Me ? Everybody's shouting ! I'm shouting with the rest. And Barabbas is a good man—a patriot—he fought these Romans. This Jesus had His chance ; He wouldn't do anything ; He wouldn't fight.' It was not simply a matter of patriotism as it might be in the modern world. Israel was the people of God. It was a religious offence that she should be trodden under the feet of the Gentiles. The Messiah must be a deliverer.

Humanly speaking the ultimate judgment upon Jesus was not that of Pilate but that of Caiaphas. And, however that trial may have begun, it ended in certainty. Jesus declared upon oath that He was the Christ. 'What need we any further witnesses ? Ye have heard the blasphemy : what think ye ?' Working up the mob, subtly forcing the hand of Pilate, were, like the bribing of Judas, merely the necessary means to an end of the rightness of which Caiaphas was devoutly convinced. He was doing his duty before God in having Jesus put to death.

They were all involved—Roman soldiers and Jewish mob, Roman Governor and Jewish leaders, the disciple who betrayed, the disciple who denied, the disciples who forsook Him and fled, the false witnesses who testified against Him, and the friends who were silent in the hour of need. Every one was ready with his excuse, but every one was guilty of His death.

'For the Christian affirmation is that a number of quite commonplace human beings, in an obscure province of the Roman Empire, killed and murdered God Almighty—quite casually, almost as a matter of religious and political routine, and certainly with no notion that they were doing anything out of the way. Their motives, on the whole, were defensible, and in some respects praiseworthy.' These words of Miss Dorothy L. Sayers go to the heart of the matter. 'Commonplace human beings,' 'quite casually, almost as a matter of religious and political routine,' 'killed and murdered God Almighty.' The ordinary behaviour, of ordinary men and women, in ordinary situations, has as its consequence the death of the Son of God. They killed Him, for the most part, with an easy conscience. Only when He died did they see the consequence of their sin.

Only at the foot of His Cross is the world in any age able to understand the consequence of its sin. 'They crucified Him.' 'We crucified Him.' 'I crucified Him.'

2. Who was He ? And why did He allow Himself to be crucified ?

For He was not a passive victim merely 'led as a lamb to the slaughter.' He foresaw His death, and forewarned His disciples. On a lower plane they foresaw His death and sought to dissuade Him from going near Jerusalem. Why did He ride in triumph into the city making an open Messianic claim ? Why, knowing that Judas had gone to betray Him, did He await the arrest in the Garden ? Why, when the false witnesses broke down, did He Himself testify before the High Priest and seal His doom ? Why was He silent before Pilate when a word might have saved Him ?

The Cross of Jesus is the work of human sin. But, if it were only that, it would be the place of our ultimate despair. The Cross of Jesus is the work also of the Son of God. What lies deepest in Calvary is not the sinful wills of men but the sinless will of Christ which perfectly reflects the will of the Father. Men cry, 'Let Him be crucified.' God says, 'Let Him be crucified.' This is the awful moment of atonement. That which man wills in

hate, God also wills in love. And so the sinful will of man and the loving will of God are reconciled for ever in the submission of the Son. They are at one. Here is the mystery of the Cross. Here is its saving power. The sin of man achieves its end—Christ is killed. And yet in achieving its end, it is deflected, and a profounder will is done; the murder is transformed into the Passion, and the sin of man is swallowed up in the love of God.

Kierkegaarde has a profound analysis of the relationship of the Messiah to His own (and every other) time. 'One can define the whole situation quite simply by taking into account its dialectic character. The "sacrifice" must be dialectically related to the age in this way: he must be capable of being what the age desires in the sense of the moment: *what the age demands*; by falsifying his mission he is *eo ipso* the idol of the age. As understood in truth he is, on the contrary, *what the age needs* in the sense of eternity. If he remains true to himself in being this, he is *eo ipso* consecrated to death. He must be so related to the age that he can lift the whole age, carry it away while it applauds him exultantly—no one else can woo it with such assurance of its love. And just when he has won it, he must with still greater energy repel it, in order to prevent the falsehood of becoming the product of his age. For that is what the age desires, it desires to admire itself in admiring him. But his task is in fact to make the age understand that the truth is not its invention.'

This situation endures and will endure to the end of human history. Jesus Christ has the power to compel the admiration of the men of every age. All men always are sure—for a time—that He is on their side. Communism is surely the expression of Christ's spirit in modern economic terms, and so He is acclaimed as the first Communist and the Communists are acclaimed as the 'real' Christians. Democracy is surely the expression of Christ's spirit with its respect for truth, justice, and human personality. So the anti-Communist West is fighting for Christ against the atheist Communist tyrannies. Each side can see and admire its own image in the mirror of Christ.

But on Passion Sunday we must be aware of the deeper truth. With Christ a new will entered history: the will of God, a will which is against the will of man in every historic form. The Cross was inevitable then as it is inevitable now. Christ was not on the side of the Jews against the Romans nor on the side of the Romans against the Jews. He was on the side of God against man. Christ is not on the side of the Communists against the Democracies, nor on the side of the Democracies against the Communists. Here Herod and Pilate make friends. Here Caiaphas and Pilate co-operate. He is on the side of God against man. He is not *what men desire* but *what men need*. He makes the place of eternal redemption. 'For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom: But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; But unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God.'

Contributions and Comments

ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί

In the Synoptic account of the work of John the Baptist, John is said to draw a distinction between his baptism and that of the 'one who is to come.' According to Mark, John says 'I baptize you with water'—*ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ὕδατι*. Matthew has roughly the same with the addition of, with a view to repentance, *εἰς μετάνοιαν*. Luke omits the reference to repentance. Mark used *βάπτιζω* in the aorist, but that is evidence of Semitic influence. He clearly means *I baptize*.

Then John goes on to explain the nature of the baptism of 'the one who is to come.' Mark says that he will baptize in *holy spirit, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*. The A.V. translates *with the Holy Ghost*. Matthew has *ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί—with the Holy Ghost and fire*. So does Luke. *Twentieth Century New Testament* and Moffatt agree in translating *with Holy Spirit*. Gould (*Mark* in *I.C.C.*) says the absence of the definite article (*ἐν πνεύματι*) shows that the Spirit is regarded as a pervading presence. This is hard to substantiate. There are plenty of cases where the definite article is omitted, where the reference is clearly to the Holy Spirit in the specifically New Testament sense of the term (cf. Mt $1^{18.\,20}$, Mk $1^{15.\,35.\,41}$). Lk 1^{67} is uncertain, as is also Lk 4^{1}, though the probability is that the reference is to *the* Holy Spirit. Jn 7^{29} is a clear case of *Holy Spirit* without the definite article. So are Ac 1^{2} and 2^{4}, and others. The New Testament generally draws no distinction between *ἅγιον πνεῦμα* and *τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα*. So that John declares that his successor will baptize with *the Holy Spirit* (so Mark), or *with Holy Spirit and fire* (so Matthew and Luke).

The phrase *Holy Spirit* is found in the Old Testament, but not in the Christian sense of the term. רוּחַ is used to mean *wind*, less often the *breath of life*, the *medium of mind, will, and knowledge*. In

all those senses it is applied to man. When רוּחַ is applied to God, it refers to His creative power, His brooding over chaos, the power of God which comes on a man enabling him to do exploits, and to the revelation of God to the prophets. For nearly all cases, LXX has πνεῦμα for רוּחַ. The adjective *holy* when applied to spirit in the Old Testament seems to imply (1) having relation to God, (2) awe-ful, and (3) intensely moral.

The phrase *the Spirit of Jehovah* is used in the Old Testament frequently, *the Spirit of God* less frequently, sometimes with *thy, his, my* attached to it. Only three times in the Old Testament is *Holy Spirit* applied to God, and then there is the pronoun *thy* or *his* attached (Is $63^{10.11}$, Ps 51^{11}). In the Old Testament the Spirit was regarded as the medium of prophetic revelation.

In the later Jewish period, the idea of the Spirit of God passed out. The active presence of the living God was experienced little by either the community or the individual.

It is not impossible that John recaptured the prophetic sense of the immediacy of God's dealings with men. He might possibly speak of the Spirit in the sense of God actively entering into the life of the expected kingdom. But he would hardly speak of *the Holy Spirit*. In Ac 19^{2} the disciples at Ephesus had not even heard that there was a Holy Spirit. This is hard to understand if John had said that his baptism was only the precursor of another baptism in the Holy Spirit. It is a safe line to go on that wherever we come across *the Holy Spirit* in the New Testament it implies the Holy Spirit in the Christian sense of the term.

Scholars have been hard beset to explain how John could say that the one to come was to baptize *with holy spirit and fire*, or *with holy spirit*. Some have said that the passage refers to the illuminating and purifying character of Messiah's baptism. Others have said that John refers to two types of hearers, some the repentant, who will be baptized with *the Spirit*, and others, the unrepentant, who will be baptized *with fire*. There is, of course, no justification whatever for this in the text. The Sinaitic Syriac of Mt 3^{11} puts *fire* before *Holy Spirit*.

Briggs suggested in 1894 that, in the original, there was no mention of Holy Spirit, but only of baptism with fire (*The Messiah of the Gospels*, 67).

Several scholars have suggested that John never said a word about the Holy Spirit. John merely predicted a baptism with fire. This was taken by the later Church to be the baptism by the Holy Spirit, seeing that one of the main tasks of the Spirit was the judgment by fire. Then the interpretation of the Church was read back into the Gospel accounts of John. Q originally had *with fire*. Mark had the interpretation with *the Holy Spirit*, and Matthew and Luke have the fire and the interpretation. (So T. W. Manson, *The Mission and Message of Jesus*, 333, repeated in his *Sayings of Jesus*, 41; Creed, *St. Luke*, 54; Marsh, *The Origin and Significance of the New Testament Baptism*, 28–29.) This explanation is far too cumbrous.

In the traditional pictures of Jewish teaching, wind and fire were often used as evidence of the presence of God, bringing judgment and devastation (cf. the story of Elijah at Carmel). In the account of Pentecost in *Acts*, we have also the combination of wind and fire. In Lk 3^{17} and Mt 3^{12} the picture of wind and fire appears. The probability seems to be that John looked upon the 'one who is to come' as a precursor of judgment only, of *wind and fire* (*ἐν πνεύματι καὶ πυρί*) (so Eisler, *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist*, Eng. tr., 275–276). The wind was devastating and was to separate the chaff from the wheat. It was part of the machinery of judgment. It was the Church that interpreted πνεῦμα in the sense of Spirit, and added the word *holy* to make all clear. In doing that, it distorted the teaching of John by making him almost, if not quite, a Christian. John had expected an Apocalyptic wind and fire, not a cleaning and refreshing and comforting spirit. He called upon men to repent, so as to escape the wrath to come. And if they did not repent, then wrath and nothing but wrath, would come.

Swansea H. J. Flowers

'Impositio Manus'

One Hand or Two?

Without prejudice to the other points raised in Dr. Matthew Black's very interesting article on 'The Doctrine of the Ministry' (The Expository Times, lxiii. [January 1952] 112–116), may I deal with a small side-issue, incidentally raised by him? Did the bishop in the Early Church impose both hands or only one? In the course of the recent discussions on the point I have not noticed any reference to a *linguistic* feature, which is common enough and which here seems to offer a very satisfactory solution.

From Dom B. Botte, through Professor T. W. Manson, Dr. Black quotes and underlines the fact that in the Latin translation of Hippolytus the ordaining bishop is described as 'imponens *manum* ei qui ordinatur episcopus' (*Apostolic Tradition*, ii. 5—Dix, p. 3). Of the currency of this phrase in the singular there is plenty of evidence in both Latin and Greek, but what is really significant is that the translator could also write (of the ordination of a deacon): 'imponens *manus* episcopus solus' and 'solus episcopus imponat *manus*' (*ib.*

x. 1—Dix, p. 15). Augustine, too, uses both the ingular and the plural freely, even in the same ontext.

What is the meaning of this plural? If the ishop had only used one hand, it is surely in-redible that any one who had been present, least f all any one interested in liturgy, should ever ave described this by a *plural*. In fact, the uestion is not whether the bishop imposed both ands or only one, but how the laying on of *both* ands came to be expressed by '*manus* impositio' r 'imponere *manum*.' For a detailed discussion must refer readers to *Studien zur Syntax der riefe des hl. Cyprian I*, by Mgr. J. Schrijnen and Miss C. Mohrmann (fasc. 5 of the notable series *Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva* [Nijmegen, 936]) where will be found a linguistic study from the New Testament onwards, leading to the explanation of Cyprian's uniform use of the singular (pp. 46–55). This turns on what is there called the 'generelle Singular'—a singular used in a general, *numerically indeterminate* sense for objects of common experience or for such as are familiar to some specific group of persons (in this case, the Christians). Its wider use can be illustrated by δάκρυ χέων, or 'Romanus sedendo vincit.' We find the pertinent parallel again to-day exactly in the German '*Hand*auflegung' in contrast with the French 'imposition *des mains*,' and even our conjurors tell us that 'it is the quickness of the hand which deceives the eye.' One *hand*, perhaps; but one *eye*?

MAURICE BÉVENOT
Heythrop College,
Chipping Norton, Oxon.

Recent Foreign Theology

The Ras Shamra Pantheon. In March 1949 Professor Eissfeldt read a paper to the Leipzig Academy on the god El in the Ugaritic pantheon, which has now been published in expanded form.[1] This is a very full study of the use of the word as a generic term for 'god,' especially in the plural *elim*, and as the name of a particular member of the pantheon. The work is richly documented, and shows a wide acquaintance with the vast literature that has grown up round the Ras Shamra texts during the last twenty years. There is a table at the end showing where each text was first published, and making it possible to locate references by Gordon's signs for the different texts as well as by Eissfeldt's signs—which are not the same—and there is also an index of passages considered. The whole forms a valuable monograph, which should be missed by no one who is interested in the Ras Shamra texts, which are so important for the understanding of the background of the Old Testament.

Baal at Ras Shamra. Dr. A. S. Kapelrud, of Oslo, whose earlier works on Ezra and Joel have been reviewed in 'Recent Foreign Theology,' has now published an important study on Baal in the texts from Ras Shamra.[2] He first establishes the nature of the Baal texts and their *Sitz im Leben*, finding them to be fundamentally ritual texts, written to be used to accompany cultic acts which they interpreted. He then turns to look at cultic usage in neighbouring countries, where similar deities figured in cultic acts whereby the springs of fertility were believed to be released. Next Dr. Kapelrud argues that Baal is referred to under other names, amongst which stands the designation 'Son of Dagan.' The relationship of Baal to other deities is examined and then his place in the pantheon. While he is never directly called the 'Son of El' he appears sometimes in this relationship to El, and Dr. Kapelrud argues that Baal was a younger deity who displaced El from his supreme place in the pantheon. He finds in the texts the motif of this displacement, as well as the annual fertility motif. Finally the varied character of Baal as a Nature deity, a fighter, the founder of a cult, and as a dying and rising god, is studied. Altogether this is an able and stimulating study, and while not a few of the points with which it deals are still in dispute amongst scholars, it should be neglected by no one interested in the Ras Shamra texts.

The Zadokite Work. Early in the present century Solomon Schechter published some fragments of what he called a Zadokite Work which were found in the Cairo Genizah. This work was much discussed and various theories as to the sect from which it came and the date of its composition were proposed. In recent years the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls has reopened the issue, since it is quite certain that the Scrolls came from members of the same sect. Professor Solomon Zeitlin, who has stoutly argued for the mediaeval dating of both the Zadokite Work and the Scrolls has now published a monograph on Schechter's fragments.[3] If for nothing else this monograph is

[1] *El im ugaritischen Pantheon* [1951]. Berichte über die Verhandlungen des sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaft zu Leipzig, Phil. Hist. Kl., Bd. 98, Heft 4. Akademie Verlag, Berlin.

[2] *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts* [1952]. Gad, Copenhagen.

[3] *The Zadokite Fragments: Facsimile of the Manuscripts in the Cairo Genizah Collection in the possession of the University Library, Cambridge, England* [1952]. Dropsie College, Philadelphia; $2.00.

of importance since it provides facsimiles of the fragments and serves to show that at not a few points Schechter's readings were not accurate. Surprisingly enough Dr. Zeitlin does not mention the excellent little edition of the Hebrew text issued by Professor L. Rost.[1] He renews his argument for a late date on the grounds that some of the terms used here were used by the Karaites, that some of the Halakoth of the Fragments could not date from a time before the destruction of the Temple or thereabouts, that the alleged reference to the Book of Jubilees cannot be to that book, and that the chronological data indicate the time of the appointment of Hillel, whom Zeitlin identifies with the Man of Lies. It is only fair to say that on none of these points has he convinced other Jews, on questions where they are more familiar with the materials than most Christian scholars, and to the reviewer, who cannot claim to be an expert in this field, his arguments do not seem to demand his conclusions. At the same time Zeitlin's challenge to the easy acceptance of other conclusions has not been without value.

[1] *Die Damaskusschrift*, in Lietzmann's Kleine Texte.

H. H. Rowley

The University, Manchester

Entre Nous

Religious Education : Biblical Archaeology

Although several useful text-books of the history of the Hebrews, notably those by W. L. Wardle [1936], and H. Wheeler Robinson [1938], have appeared since 1932, the two-volume *History of Israel* which was produced in that year by T. H. Robinson and W. O. E. Oesterley is still the main work in English on the subject and the source to which the teacher turns for fuller information. But already in the second impression of Volume I, which was issued in 1934, Professor Robinson was constrained to admit that archaeology had made such strides that much of his introductory section had to be regarded as being out-of-date. Since then, of course, there has been great progress in archaeological discovery, and new light has been thrown on many passages of the Bible.

' Horites, see Hurrians '—this entry in the index of a recent work may serve to introduce the first illustration of the way in which archaeology may correct our interpretations of historical data and fill in the gaps in our knowledge. It might be introduced by contrasting the definition of Horite in the standard Hebrew Lexicon of Brown, Driver, and Briggs, published in 1907 with that in a Lexicon still in process of being edited by Koehler. The earlier work says Horite probably means a cave-dweller ; the later identifies this people with the Hurrians. In Oesterley and Robinson's *History* the ' Horim ' are called ' Troglodytes ' and the Hurrians are not mentioned.

Though most of our knowledge about this people is of comparatively recent discovery, the first piece of archaeological evidence of their existence, an Amarna letter written in Hurrian, was published in 1889. Since then information about the Hurrians has been forthcoming from such places as Boghaz Keui, the Hittite capital, and Ras Shamra. But it is above all from the thousands of tablets excavated at Nuzu since 1925 and at Mari since 1935 that scholars have been able to reconstruct the life of this people. Now they are seen to be not ' a neolithic people of large stature but of low culture,' to be classed with Dr. Robinson's other local groups, the ' Horrors ' and ' Howlers,' but rather a great and highly civilized power in western Asia for about a thousand years before 1200 B.C. They were thus a leading nation in the Patriarchal Age, and their life and culture fills in part of the background of the world conditions of the time and throws light on several passages of the Biblical narrative.

But not all archaeological discoveries lead to such momentous results as the restoration of a major power to the pages of our history books. Less striking though none the less very valuable results may be illustrated by three passages chosen from the Book of Samuel. The first is 1 S 13^{21} : ' Yet they had a file for the mattocks, and for the coulters, and for the forks, and for the axes, and to sharpen the goads.' This verse, which occurs in a passage describing the Philistine ' corner ' in iron-working, used to be characterized as ' hopelessly corrupt.' The chief, though not the only, difficulty in the verse has been presented by the translation of the opening words, ' Yet they had a file,' on which a marginal comment in the A.V. gives, as the literal meaning of the Hebrew, ' a file with mouths.' Confidence in this rendering is not increased when it is realized that our EVV have but taken over an ancient Jewish guess at the meaning of two Hebrew words which do not occur elsewhere in the Old Testament. The obscure ' mouths ' of the file in the marginal note has no more support than that the Hebrew term *pîm* bears a not too close resemblance to the Hebrew word for ' mouths.' Nor does the translation of the verse in the EVV fit the context, for the natural continuation of *v.* 20 would be not some mitigation of the hardships suffered by the Hebrews through their lack of a smith to sharpen their tools but

rather an addition to the description of the conditions of the Philistine oppression of the Jews. For example, the Greek version seemed to understand the second half of the verse as a reference to the high price exacted for the services of the smith.

There the matter stood until the spade turned up weights weighing two-thirds of a shekel and inscribed with this word *pîm*. With this clue afforded by archaeology and with the help of the Greek version it is now possible so to interpret the Hebrew that although some details are not yet certain the general sense is clear. The new *American Standard Revised Version* has : ' and the charge was a pim for the plowshares and for the mattocks, and a third of a shekel for sharpening the axes and for setting the goads.' The Philistines, by demanding an exorbitant price for sharpening the agricultural tools of their subjects, were guarding against the danger of the Hebrews furnishing themselves with a store of these articles made sharp and fit for use as weapons.

The combat described in 2 S $2^{14ff.}$ is generally regarded as beginning in a display of mimic warfare between two teams of twelve young men. This is the view, for example, of A. R. S. Kennedy in *The Century Bible*. He writes : ' But at the first onset each combatant treacherously " caught his opponent by the head with his hand " (so LXX), and plunged his sword into his side, the whole twenty-four falling together.' The reader is left with a feeling of uneasiness about the coincidence of the two groups adopting independently the same stratagem at exactly the same moment.

It has been suggested that what Abner proposed and Joab agreed to was not a sporting contest between two teams of young men but a grim duel between picked warriors, a meaning which ' young men ' had in some languages of the Near East. This was not a mock battle ; it was the real thing, a fight between champions to decide the issue for the two armies, just as the David–Goliath duel settled the issue between the Israelities and the Philistines, as the words of Goliath's challenge make plain (1 S $17^{8f.}$). The duel proposed by Abner might have saved bloodshed in this, the first, battle of the civil war in Israel, but the result was indecisive and a major battle was still necessary.

If this reconstruction of the incident as a duel is correct, the method of fighting adopted must be regarded as a practice common in duelling at that time. Confirmation of this, it has recently been suggested, is afforded by a relief from Tell Halaf which portrays two figures locked in combat, each holding his opponent's head and thrusting his sword into his opponent's side. Similar scenes have been found on seals from Mesopotamia. The fall of the contestants by the pool of Gibeon, therefore, was not due to the unanimous and simultaneous adoption of a treacherous trick ; they fell in a duel conducted in a regular and recognized manner. The outcome only was unexpected, but the Tell Halaf relief, in which only one of the contestants has been able to drive home his sword, shows that the result was not necessarily always so indecisive.

The third example is taken from an earlier phase of the Hebrew struggle against the Philistines. After describing the defeat of the Israelite army and the capture of the Ark (1 S 4), Professor Robinson, in his *History of Israel* (p. 163), writes : ' We hear no more of Shiloh, which must have been taken and sacked at this time.' The Old Testament does not describe the destruction of Shiloh, but Danish excavations begun in 1926 have shown that it was completely destroyed and abandoned about the middle of the eleventh century, the period of the Philistine conquests, and it lay in ruins for six hundred years (cf. Jer 7^{12} 26^{9}). The conjecture of the historian has thus been confirmed by the finds of the archaeologist.

W. D. McHardy

University of London

East Africa—The Missionary Factor

Wireless and newspapers bring us word of tragic unrest in East Africa these days and conflicting voices tell us what is wrong. There are always those who see in the work of the Missions the root cause of all ' native ' troubles, agreeing with the German Count Pfeil who said in 1886 : ' If they would scrap all this reading and writing and praying and concentrate exclusively on teaching the native to work, they would find that their pupils would acquire in the process as much religious instruction as was suitable for the nigger.' Others, genuinely interested in missionary work see Africa only through the tinted spectacles of the missionary biographer, yet are distressed to read of the savagery of Mau Mau in a land to whose Christian good they have devoted prayer and pence. ' So many years I give money to convart the world,' complained a Jamaican subscriber to the Calabar Mission. ' It no' convart yet ? '

Critic and supporter alike will find in *The Missionary Factor in East Africa*, by Dr. Roland Oliver (Longmans ; cloth, 17s. 6d. net, paper covers, 12s. 6d. net), a balanced survey of missionary influence in the development of East Africa. This is the first book to give a connected account of the enterprise of all the denominations of the Christian Church there during the past century. One cannot imagine it better done. It is all the more valuable in being the work of a professional historian who has no connexion with any missionary society, and whose information

is culled not only from missionary publications and private records but also from Foreign Office archives.

It is almost impossible to-day to realize that less than a hundred years ago East Africa was a backwater, European contact being limited to the coast. Of that vast territory which stretched through arid foothills to the highland plateaux and the fertile and densely populated regions of the great lakes, the white man knew nothing. It was the life and writings of David Livingstone which struck exactly the note which would carry farthest in mid-Victorian Britain. In missionary circles the talk was no longer of 'perishing heathen' but of Africans 'suffering' and 'neglected.' Soon it was to be of 'open doors' and 'untouched millions.' Thus, forty years before the European Governments appeared on the scene, British Protestant missionaries and French Catholic fathers were opening up East Africa.

The first mission stations were settlements for the in-gathering and up-bringing of freed slaves, rootless individuals torn from their tribal background. Dr. Oliver notes a difference of opinion on the home front at that time about the purpose of missionary work. Roman Catholics and Calvinists were concerned to teach not only religious dogma and morals but also all the arts of civilized life. The Evangelical Protestant subscriber, on the other hand, paid and prayed for 'conversions.' 'I am entirely in favour of the Lay Evangelist, the Female Evangelist, the Medical Evangelist, wherever Gospel preaching is the substantive work; but when it is proposed to have a pious Industrial Superintendent, or an Evangelical tile-manufacturer, or a Low Church breeder of cattle or raiser of turnips, I draw my line.' A generation later the Evangelicals were to discover that the pious superintendents were a necessary part of successful missions, so much so that if laymen were not available, then ordained missionaries must be devoted to the job.

These 'centres of Christianity and civilization' were only oases in the tribal desert rather than running springs which would flow out and irrigate the whole. Here, perhaps, Dr. Oliver puts his finger on a weakness of mission organization in East Africa. There came a phase during which Christian teaching met with complete indifference from the tribal communities and when their only adherents were men and women who, to some extent, cut themselves off from the tribal life, who had settled on the mission's land, and were dependent on the mission's wages. Black magic to-day is partly a seeking back towards a sense of 'belonging,' which is implicit in tribal ways.

At the time of the British taking over in East Africa, H. H. Johnston, the pioneer Empire-builder, said: 'The chief hold we have over these regions comes from the quite extraordinary work done by those four missionary societies, the C.M.S., L.M.S., Universities Mission, and Free Church of Scotland Mission. Each mission station is an essay in colonization.' Notable commendation from one not himself a Christian, yet implying danger for the Christian future. Not only the African nationalist to-day but too often the average British onlooker tends to think of the Mission as an arm of colonial expansion and control.

Dr. Oliver reminds us that it was the Missions who provided the Government with clerks, interpreters, policemen, semi-skilled builders, orderlies, and domestic servants as the flag followed the Cross from Uganda to the sea. It was missionaries who introduced the coffee, cotton, and rubber into East Africa on which so much of the economic prosperity of the country depends to-day. It was missionaries who traced the rivers, charted the lakes, climbed the mountains, measured the rainfall, and calculated the temperature, and who prepared the grammars and dictionaries of the various languages and printed the first books.

But this book is much more than a historical survey, first-class as it is in that respect. The writer sees clearly present-day trends in missionary work, and points out the paramount importance of theological training in the nascent African churches. The aim of the European missionary to-day is the euthanasia of the Mission and the birth and growth of a settled African community, the Christian fellowship, in fact. The baptism of the African convert confers a citizenship which knows nothing of the invidious distinction between a 'British subject' and a 'British protected person.' Unlike the Government, there is no 'indirect rule' in Christian policy. European clergy and laymen have long been accustomed to sit as minorities among Africans in governing synods and assemblies of the Church.

No one who wishes to understand East African affairs during the past century can afford to miss this book. Dr. Oliver has the wisdom to omit much that is of transitory importance in order to show us something of the abiding reality of the African church. This is sound history, lucidly told, and his conclusions are unchallengeable. And, by way of footnote, surely never were footnotes so fascinating as in this book.

DONALD M. MCFARLAN

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

POSTAL TUITION

FOR THE LONDON UNIVERSITY

B.D.

& M.Th. DEGREES; DIPLOMA IN THEOLOGY; CERTIFICATE IN RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

London University Examinations are open to all. University residence is unnecessary. Candidates may read at home, and without interfering with their normal day's work.

Many ministers have secured London B.A., B.D. & M.Th. degrees through entrusting their entire preparation to Wolsey Hall. In the hands of experienced and sympathetic graduate tutors home study becomes a pleasure. Fees are moderate, and may be spread over the period of the Course. Moreover, should you be compelled to suspend or discontinue the Course, for *any* reason, *no* further instalments are payable beyond those due at the time. In the event of failure, tuition is continued *free of charge.*

LONDON UNIVERSITY B.D., (EXTERNAL) EXAMINATION, 1952:

23

WOLSEY HALL STUDENTS PASSED,

forming

HALF THE PASS LIST

PROSPECTUS FREE

Write for Prospectus, mentioning the examination which interests you. You may obtain a copy, without incurring the least obligation, from C. D. Parker, M.A., LL.D., Director of Studies, Dept. GE 41,

Wolsey Hall, Oxford

PROPRIETORS: DIPLOMA CORRESPONDENCE COLLEGE, LTD.

JUST PUBLISHED

A New Volume of

"THE SPEAKER'S BIBLE"

Editor :

Rev. E. Hastings, M.A., D.D.

GALATIANS and THESSALONIANS

14s. 6d. *net*

INTRODUCTIONS by
Principal Vincent Taylor, Ph.D., D.D.
and Rev. R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc.

A Library of Exposition, Fully Illustrated, with Special Studies by Modern Scholars.

To be had from the Booksellers, or direct from the Publishers

"THE SPEAKER'S BIBLE" OFFICES
KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN

Again Available

Series	*Net*
INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY	
MOORE'S Judges	20s.
BATTEN'S Ezra and Nehemiah	18s.
BARTON'S Ecclesiastes	18s.
INTERNATIONAL THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY	
MOFFATT'S Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament	21s.
THE WORLD'S EPOCH MAKERS	
FORBES'S Socrates	6s.
FAIRWEATHER'S Origen and Greek Patristic Theology	6s.
JOHNSTONE'S Muhammad and His Power	6s.
INNES'S Cranmer and the English Reformation	6s.

General

MANUAL GREEK LEXICON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT
Rev. Canon ABBOTT-SMITH, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. 30s.

ISRAEL'S WISDOM LITERATURE
Rev. Professor O. S. RANKIN, D.D., D.Litt. 12s. 6d.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF MAN
Rev. Principal H. WHEELER ROBINSON, D.D. 16s.

THE LIFE, LETTERS AND RELIGION OF ST. PAUL
Rev. C. T. WOOD, B.D. 15s. 6d.

ST. AUGUSTINE'S THE CITY OF GOD
Edited by Professor MARCUS DODS
Two Volumes Each 12s. 6d.

38 GEORGE STREET
EDINBURGH, 2

T. & T. CLARK

Essential Christianity

WILLIAM E. WILSON

Why, in spite of the Gospel of Christ, have Christian nations been, for hundreds of years, the greatest exploiters and war-makers? Not, writes Mr. Wilson, because of deliberate rejection of that Gospel, but because of additions to it, which by the number and importance assigned to them, have obscured the essential thing. His able book sets out wisely and from a wide knowledge these convictions which have gradually grown clearer and more compelling.

12*s.* 6*d. net*

An Analysis of Resemblance

R. W. CHURCH, M.A.

This work is not concerned with any sense of resemblance in which that term is used by thinkers, generally and widely called Hegelian Idealists. He advances an analysis of four senses of resemblance. Two of these would seem to be radical—in the etymological sense of the term. The other two senses are derivative. Professor Church's clearly stated ideas will arouse much discussion. 12*s.* 6*d. net*

Studies in Philosophy

Professor R. F. A. HOERNLÉ

Studies in Philosophy consists of the mature reflections of the late Professor R. F. A. Hoernlé in the fields of epistemology and metaphysical logic. The book also contains a short memoir of the author, who won an international reputation as an original thinker. Some of the subjects discussed by Professor Hoernlé are Theory of Knowledge, Truth and Error, Fact and Value, Knowledge and Faith, Philosophy and Language, and The Meanings of Mind. 30*s. net*

ALLEN & UNWIN

40 MUSEUM ST., LONDON, W.C.1

Christian Faith and the Scientific Attitude
by W. A. WHITEHOUSE, M.A., B.LITT.
Demy 8vo. 156 pages. 12/6 *net.*

The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God
A Study in the Theology of John Calvin
by T. H. L. PARKER, M.A., B.D.
Demy 8vo. 128 pages. 10/6 *net.*

Thomas Becon and the Reformation of the Church in England
by D. S. BAILEY, Ph.D.
Demy 8vo. 172 pages. 15/- *net.*

The Doctrine of Grace in the Apostolic Fathers
by T. F. TORRANCE, M.B.E., D.Theol., D.D.
Demy 8vo. 158 pages. 12/6 *net.*

OLIVER AND BOYD
Tweeddale Court, Edinburgh

Distinctive Printing

WILL ALWAYS APPEAL!

We shall be pleased to submit suggestions for your **PRINTING** and **PUBLICITY REQUIREMENTS**

Write for particulars now to

MORRISON & GIBB Ltd.
PRINTERS • • BOOKBINDERS
TANFIELD, EDINBURGH

W. & A. K. JOHNSTON Ltd.
LITHOGRAPHERS • MAP PRINTERS
EDINA WORKS, EASTER ROAD, EDINBURGH

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. *Registered for Transmission by Canadian Magazine Post. Entered as Second-Class Matter 15th March 1929, at the Post Office, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH, 2. *Annual Subscription, including postage, 19s. 6d. net.*

AGENTS—WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON, E.C.4. CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

ADVERTISING DEPARTMENT—KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN. *Rates—£10, 10s. per page; smaller spaces pro rata. 'Copy' to be received not later than the 6th of the previous month.*